DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 017 EC 150 085

AUTHOR	Evans, Joyce
TITLE	Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training: Field Based Inservice for Those Who Work with Handicapped Children. Volume II. Final Report, June 1978-May 1981.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	30 May 81
GRANT	G007801431
NOTE	137p.; For related document, see ED 204 983.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Competency Based Teacher Education; Delivery Systems; *Disabilities; Early Childhood Education; *Inservice Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Paraprofessional Personnel; Program Descriptions; Program Development; Records (Forms); State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training; *Texas

ABSTRACT

Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training (APT), a 3-year project, addressed the need for training paraprofessionals working with young handicapped children in rural and urban areas of Texas. Objectives of the project were: to identify competencies needed by paraprofessionals in working with young, handicapped children; to identify the needs of employed paraprofessionals; and to develop and conduct field based inservice training for paraprofessionals from day care settings, Head Start settings, public and private special education classroom settings, and public and private regular classroom settings. The need for training paraprofessionals was delineated in relation to state needs; regional/national needs; and other needs, such as the need to train day care workers and preschool teachers. Multiple teaching strategies such as role play, filmstrips, and simulation were used throughout training. The project design contained the following components: a completed description of competency aeas, work sessions focusing on a single topic area which lasted approximately 3 hours each, field based training, evaluation of training sessions, and dissemination activities. Issues or problems having an impact on the APT project were scheduling, credentialling, motivation, participation, and evaluation. Appended materials include unsolicited letters and comments on training, work session descriptions, a sample certificate of recognition, site report summaries, and examples of evaluation forms. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222017

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ALTERNATIVES FOR PARAPROFESSIONAL TRAINING:

Field Based Inservice for Those Who Work With Handicapped Children: Volume II

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 451 BH 00022
Grant No. G007801431

Joyce Evans, Ph.D.
Project Director

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

James H. Perry, Ed.D.
Executive Director

May 30, 1981

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Department of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Department of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

EC 150085

CONTENT

ABSTRACT 1

INTRODUCTION 3

OBJECTIVES 4

BACKGROUND 5

OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITIES TO DATE 11

DESIGN OF PROJECT AND TRAINING 13

- COMPETENCIES 15
- WORKSESSIONS 16
- TRAINING CONDUCTED 17
- EVALUATION 21
- DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES 24

OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS 29

SUGGESTIONS TO OTHERS 31

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: UNSOLICITED LETTERS AND COMMENTS OF TRAINING

APPENDIX B: WORKSESSIONS

APPENDIX C: CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION

APPENDIX D: SITE REPORT SUMMARIES

APPENDIX E: EXAMPLES OF EVALUATION FORMS

ALTERNATIVES FOR PARAPROFESSIONAL TRAINING:

Field-Based Inservice for Those Who Work with Handicapped Children

FINAL REPORT

Joyce Evans, Ph.D.
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East Seventh Street, Austin, Texas 78701

ABSTRACT

Increasing numbers of young handicapped children are entering public schools and child care programs (public and private) throughout the state of Texas. All indications suggest that this growth trend will continue over the next five years. As a result, all sectors are faced with the task of serving young handicapped children without adequate staff preparation or funds. In attempts to maintain cost-effectiveness and still provide additional personnel, paraprofessionals often are employed to provide direct or supplementary assistance to handicapped children. However, paraprofessional preparation, either pre-service or inservice, has been and continues to be inadequate.

Over the past three years (June 1978 - May 1981), Alternatives for Paraprofessional Trainning (APT) addressed the need for training employed paraprofessionals in working with young handicapped children in rural and urban areas of Texas. APT provided on-site competency-based training for paraprofessionals through a variety of alternatives matched to system-specific needs. In addition, complementary training was provided the supervising teacher to facilitate effective utilization of APT trained professionals.

During the first and second years of the APT project, a core set of competencies for paraprofessionals were identified, a training needs survey completed and related training sessions were developed. Using a process-training model, core competencies were matched with system-specific requirements and training needs in order to conduct field-based training designed to meet individual site needs. During the first year of the project, 6,000 participant-training hours were delivered for more than 1,000 attendees in rural and urban locations throughout the state. In the second year,

approximately 7,500 participant-training hours were delivered for 1,200 attendees. A comprehensive report of first and second year activities was completed in August 1980 (Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training, Volume I) and submitted for entry into the ERIC system.

During the third year of the project, more than 7,000 per participant hours of training were provided through 35 training workshops conducted in project sites. More than 1,000 individuals participated in one or more training sessions for paraprofessionals and supervising teachers. Project training was conducted in 10 primary locations throughout the state and in 3 of these sites training was also provided for local staff development personnel. This report, which summarizes third year activities also includes a brief description of problems encountered and points to consider for others who conduct training of a similar nature.

ALTERNATIVES FOR PARAPROFESSIONAL TRAINING: FINAL REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Full service to handicapped individuals, age three through twenty-one, has been mandated by state and federal legislation and through litigation establishing the right of free public education. In Texas, children classified as deaf, blind, or deaf-blind are eligible for services beginning at birth. A downward extension of services to include all handicapped children under the age of three is a concern of the Texas Education Agency. In addition to public school services, Head Start is mandated to include handicapped children within the regular preschool setting. Title XX child care centers also serve young handicapped children. Because of the growth trend of the population within the state, Texas finds itself with a sizeable and increasing number of handicapped individuals.

The most immediate problem facing the state of Texas in providing special education services is the lack of trained and qualified personnel. One method of addressing this need is the recruiting, training, or retraining of professionals. Another method, the one utilized in this project, is the training and use of the untapped resources of paraprofessionals who work in day care and public school settings with young handicapped children. Training paraprofessionals necessitates the design of instructional alternatives linked to a competency-based general program with alternatives uniquely suited to the individual sites, the capacities of the paraprofessionals, and the needs of the handicapped children served. It also necessitates the training of teachers and supervisors in the effective use of paraprofessionals.

With additional unserved handicapped children being identified at a time when school districts are economically hard pressed to provide trained personnel, it is necessary to seek the maximum utilization of existing resources. Further, early identification and assistance to these children will increase if those serving them, the teacher aide, have the necessary teaching skills.

Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training focused on the development and field implementation of alternative training programs for (a) paraprofessionals who assist certified teachers within the public school systems and (b) paraprofessionals who work with young handicapped children within public and private child care settings. For the purpose of the project, paraprofessionals were defined as those non-degreed individuals who were not certified or did not have specialized training in the area of special education of young handicapped children. In addition, the training of teachers/supervisors in the utilization of paraprofessionals receiving training was undertaken.

Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training was funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped for a three year period beginning in June 1978. A previous report (Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training, Vol. 1, August 1980) detailed project activities and training conducted during the first and second years of the project. This report (Vol. II) details third year activities.

OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the project, Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training (APT) was to increase the knowledge, skills, and utilization of paraprofessionals working with young handicapped children in public schools and in private and public child care and preschool programs. The project provided for competency-based training which incorporates alternatives for local adaptation to meet the needs of individual centers and schools. Field-based training was projected at a minimum of 5,000 participant hours of training or an estimated 300 persons each year.

The objectives of the project were:

- -To identify competencies needed by paraprofessionals in working with young, handicapped children.
- -To identify the training needs of employed paraprofessionals in working with young handicapped children.
- -To develop field-based, training for paraprofessionals related to identified competencies and training needs.
- -To conduct field-based, training for paraprofessionals related to identified competencies and training needs.
- -To conduct field-based inservice training for paraprofessionals representing the following settings:
  - --Day Care setting which include young, handicapped children
  - --Head Start settings which include young, handicapped children
  - --Public and private special education classrooms which serve preschool handicapped children
  - --Public and private school regular classroom setting which include handicapped children of elementary age or younger

These objectives were addressed throughout the project period (June 1978 - May, 1981). The number of paraprofessionals and supervising teachers who received training exceeded the original projections of approximately 5,000 participant training hours. During the first year 6,000 participant hours of training were delivered, the second year included more than 7,500 participant hours of training and during the third year over 7,000 participant hours of training were delivered.

In the following sections, an overview of third year activities is followed by sections describing the project design and training conducted.

BACKGROUND

The need for training paraprofessionals was delineated in the original proposal as submitted to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the Fall of 1977 and updated in continuation proposals for the Fall of 1978 and 1979. These needs were described in relation to: (1) state needs, (2) regional/national needs, and (3) other needs. The following summary from the original proposal provides background to the project which was funded and initiated in June, 1978:

1. State Needs

The passage fo SB 230 by the 61st Legislature of the State of Texas authorized expanded services for handicapped students (including three-year-olds). Following a planning year (1969-70), the Texas Education Agency (TEA), set full-service implementation of its Plan A concept of special education as the goal for the decade. Under Plan A, school districts are responsible for providing special education services on a generic basis to all exceptional children ages three through twenty-one. In addition, Plan A requires that a minimum of 15 percent of services and resources be allocated to children in the three-, four-, and five-year-old range and permits use of funds for teacher aides and other support staff. This expansion of services to include preschool handicapped children has resulted in a shortage of adequately trained personnel to serve them. According to TEA's State Analysis of Personnel Positions for academic year 1977-78, 271 of the 445 professionals serving preschool handicapped children were not certified in that area and 20 positions across the state remained unfilled. While the State Analysis indicates that all paraprofessional positions are currently filled, it does not give an indication that these positions are filled by individuals who are trained or prepared to meet the needs of the children with whom they are working. However, the lack of training among professional personnel is in all likelihood an indication of an even greater lack of training among paraprofessional personnel.

Further evidence of the need for trained paraprofessionals is found in the TEA-projected need for personnel by 1980. The State Analysis for the 1977-78 school year showed that 5,986 paraprofessionals were employed in Texas. According to Fiscal Year 1979 Annual Program Plan for Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act as amended by Public Law 94-142, this figure has increased to 6,105 paraprofessionals employed for the current year and TEA has projected that by 1980 an additional 4,000 paraprofessionals will be needed in the state. If 15 percent of these positions are assigned to early childhood special education classrooms, an additional 600 paraprofessionals will be needed to work with preschool handicapped children.

There is every reason to believe that this gap in training will not soon be filled. In TEA's Annual Program Plan for Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act (Fiscal Year 1979), it was reported that 327,308 children (infant projects not included) received special education services during 1977-78. Of those children, 32701 were in the pre-elementary

category. Other children are not yet being served. Data from Phase II of the Project Child Find indicated that as of June 30, 1977, 1,356 identified handicapped children between ages three and five and 74 children between zero and two were not being served. The data represent an even greater need for services in this age group than had previously been projected.

Despite the evidence of the need for trained paraprofessionals, limited effort is being made to train them. Eight junior colleges in Texas offer associate degrees for teacher aides (as reported by the Texas Association of Public Junior College, 1976). Only four junior colleges offer a curriculum related to special education (Dallas County Junior college -- Special Education Aide program; Mountain View College -- Teacher Aide program; Del Mar College -- Mental Health Associate program; and Austin Community College -- A.A. in Education for the Deaf). It is obvious, however, that these programs cannot keep pace with the growing need, nor do they address the needs of those paraprofessionals who are presently employed. The programs are located in large urban areas and emphasize a traditional, college-oriented type of training, with practicum or volunteer work in a public school or clinical setting. This traditional approach frequently eliminates participation of the paraprofessional already working in a setting with young children. Therefore, alternative strategies for meeting the training needs of the currently employed paraprofessional must be developed and made available.

2. Regional/National Needs

While the need to provide training to paraprofessionals is evident throughout the state of Texas, it is not limited to Texas. A survey conducted by the Center for Urban Education estimated that in 1970, 200,000 paraprofessionals were involved in educational programs. An estimated 1.5 million were predicted to be employed in 1977 (cited by Schortinghuis and Frohman, 1974). Paraprofessionals are currently employed in every state, territory (except Virgin Islands), and the District of Columbia to serve all handicapped populations in the full range of activities (New Careers Training Laboratory, 1974). In a survey of 348 facilities which utilized paraprofessionals, 320 (92 percent) indicated that paraprofessionals were in need of training (New Careers Training Laboratory, 1974). Responses from directors repeatedly emphasized that paraprofessionals should serve as an integral part of the special education staff and indicated that with training, they could handle many classroom activities efficiently and effectively. The report also indicated that paraprofessionals were perceived as an essential element in providing individualized educational programs as well as adding additional insights into the problems of handicapped children. However, in regard to training, the New Careers Training Laboratory report says:

(1) With the exception of isolated programs, a majority of the paraprofessionals had no pre-service training and had uncoordinated in-service training which was often optional and, at best, infrequent.

(2) The differentiated staffing pattern of a professional and a paraprofessional in one classroom was frequently a source of conflict, in that the human aspect of two adults providing educational services which were not clearly defined or sanctioned, led to misinterpretation by either or both parties.

(3) Very little training has been given to paraprofessionals or teachers of "regular" classrooms to enable them to receive handicapped children who are beginning to be "mainstreamed."

(4) Finally, a majority of the personnel interviewed, as well as persons contacted in surveys, indicated that paraprofessionals could be more effective in the program if training, both pre-service and on-the-job, was available.

In a report by the University of New Mexico (September, 1977) on paraprofessional training programs in special education and related fields across the nation, 77 programs are described. Of the 77 programs, 73 are training programs directly tied to a college setting, i.e., junior or senior college. Fifty-four of these programs are preservice programs; nine are inservice programs; and only six offered both services. In many of these training programs (37), participants were required to have a high school degree or a GED for enrollment. Further, only 29 of the 77 programs cited utilized competency-based training. Although most of the programs described included some type of practicum, it is obvious that the majority of these programs focus on meeting the training needs of student level participants, not on the training needs of paraprofessionals who are already employed. It is doubtful that these programs could meet the full training needs of paraprofessionals working with young handicapped children since only 10 programs focus specifically on preschool handicapped children.

3. Other Needs

a. Need to Train Day Care Workers and Preschool Teachers

With the 1973 Congressional mandate to include handicapped children in Head Start enrollment and the recently signed regulation on the rights of handicapped citizens, an increasing number of preschool handicapped children are being served in public child care facilities. The Texas Department of Human Resources reports that 17,000 Title XX eligible children have been identified and that public and private facilities within the state have the capacity to serve 274,448 children under the age of 14. If only half of these children were under the age of 6, the capacity would be 137,224. Using a minimal 8% to estimate the number of handicapped children served in day care programs, as many as 8,978 children are possibly included, many of whom are not yet identified. For the most part, the teacher-staff in day care centers are paraprofessionals. Usually, only high school degrees are required for employment. With the increasing enrollment of handicapped children in day care centers, there exists a need in these settings to train

both the teacher and the aide. While there have been efforts nationally to train Head Start personnel to work with handicapped children, personnel in Title XX day care are ill-prepared to serve the handicapped children who are enrolled. In addition, there are no services available to them to provide such training, and previously provided funds for general training have been cut in half.

The vast needs of day care personnel have been recognized by several junior colleges within the state. They have entered into Child Development Associate (CDA) training programs designed to assist paraprofessionals. However, these programs focus on the non-handicapped child. Direct instruction related to the handicapped child is rarely a focus. One major problem is the fact that the majority of those conducting the CDA training programs are trained in child development and do not have the necessary background in special education to provide training in this area. This situation illustrates the need to integrate training of paraprofessionals to work with handicapped children into existing CDA training programs as an alternative approach. However, other alternatives are still needed for those paraprofessionals who are unable to attend college or university-based training courses. These needs could best be met through field-based training programs.

b. Need to Train Teachers to Use Paraprofessionals

With the increasing use of paraprofessionals in special education classrooms, the role of the teacher is changing. If paraprofessionals are to be utilized to their maximum, teachers and other school supervisory personnel must be prepared to supervise them. Too often this aspect of the teacher's role is neglected in preservice training programs. As trained paraprofessionals enter the classroom, teachers will need training in how to work with them in establishing areas of responsibility, expectations, planning and organization. National surveys have shown that only 5% of the certified teachers have been instructed in the use of paraprofessionals (Klopf, et al., 1972). It is probable that even fewer teachers know how to best use a trained paraprofessional in working with handicapped children. Paraprofessionals can be an invaluable and usable resource only if the teacher is aware of the skills which the paraprofessional possesses and is knowledgeable about ways to best use these skills. There is, then, a need to complement the training of paraprofessionals with instruction for teachers and other supervisors in methods of employing the paraprofessional to maximize the effect in the classroom.

c. Need for Paraprofessional Training Programs

Since the mid-1960's, when educators began to recognize and acknowledge on a national level the need for paraprofessional aides in the preschool classroom, a number of training programs have been developed. A majority of these were government sponsored and directed primarily toward working with children from low-income families. Chief among them were Project Head Start and Day Care. From its inception, Head Start sought to meet the shortage of certified teachers and the lack of job opportunities in the communities served by encouraging employment of indigenous persons. It provides paraprofessional staff development through on-the-job training, structured

learning experiences, series of proficiency levels, testing and evaluation of the trainees, and a pay and title advancement plan (Project Head Start, 1969). In developing Day Care training, the Office of Child Development has noted that traditional college training is perhaps not the best approach to preparing persons to work with young children. They, too, stress on-the-job training, with job status geared to the development of competencies (Day Care #5, 1973). In contrast to these fairly flexible, nationwide programs, Karnes, et al. (1971) implemented a highly structured training program with daily meetings before school and an emphasis on well-planned lessons. These and most other training programs for paraprofessionals at the preschool level have focused on preparing persons to work with children whose primary deviance from the norm is that they are predominantly from low-income families. Preparation to work with children of special needs--those with hearing, vision, orthopedic, and other handicapping conditions--has received far less attention.

The needs of special education have been receiving increasing attention, and some strides have been made in preparing paraprofessionals to work with the handicapped. Under a BEH grant, the League School in New York developed new approaches to train teachers, parents, and paraprofessionals to work with severely disturbed children. The school stressed both practical and theoretical knowledge in a six-week program that included lectures, discussions, classroom observation, and films and demonstrations (League School). The Portage Project in Wisconsin (Schortinghuis and Frohman, 1974) focused on home intervention for handicapped preschoolers. Training for both professionals and paraprofessionals included a one-week preservice workshop plus one-half day per week inservice for all staff and an additional half day for paraprofessionals to work with the training coordinator. One of the most extensive training models was developed at the New Careers Training Lab. (1974). Training areas developed in this study were possible job titles, core areas, techniques for training, possible options, and suggested workshops for inservice training. In another study, Kaufman (1970) reported guidelines for training paraprofessionals and reported on how these were implemented at the Houston Speech and Hearing Center. BEH recognizes this need for training of paraprofessionals through their personnel preparation support.

As previously discussed, other training programs have been developed at junior and senior colleges which follow the traditional approach of course work, usually combined with some type of practicum. Some of these programs have also prepared "training guides," or descriptions of the instructional-course program. For example, the Sinclair Community College (Johnson, 1977) has developed A Handbook for Paraprofessional Training. Again, this commendable approach has limitations in that the individual must be eligible for and enrolled in a college.

While these and other programs have made progress in testing ways in which paraprofessionals can be trained to serve effectively in the preschool classroom with handicapped youngsters, a majority of the programs have either ignored special needs students or failed to provide planned training programs for the paraprofessionals who are or could be working with them. A smaller number of programs have been successful on a limited scale, but they can neither be evaluated nor replicated.

SUMMARY

The evidence supporting the need for training paraprofessionals who are working with young handicapped children is clearly demonstrated at all levels. Several factors have combined to create this situation: (1) the rapidly escalating cost of providing quality educational services to young handicapped children in both public schools and child care facilities; (2) federal and state legislation requiring the provision of free, appropriate educational services for all handicapped children ages three through twenty-one; (3) a rapidly increasing population in Texas and the South and Southwestern region of the country; (4) an increasing number of children identified as needing special education services in the 0 to 6 age range; and (5) the lack of training programs designed specifically for paraprofessionals presently working with young handicapped children.

As educational costs increase and increases occur in the number of handicapped children entering public schools and day care facilities, many are looking to the use of paraprofessional personnel to maintain or improve adult/child ratios. However, the paraprofessional can no longer be used simply as a "cleanup person" who has no direct contact with the children. If paraprofessionals are to be integrated into the educational process and provide quality care for handicapped children, they must be trained to provide this care and teachers must be trained to supervise them in their work.

The training programs which are presently in operation around the state and the country have failed to address themselves to the clear and present need for training employed paraprofessionals working with handicapped children and for teachers/supervisors in the best utilization of such trained personnel. Training for these individuals can best be accomplished through field-based inservice training focusing on the specific needs of preschool handicapped children and the capabilities of both the paraprofessional and the professional. Before training can be truly effective, a core set of competencies must be identified for both public school and child care settings.

The identification of a core set of competencies for working with handicapped children allows for the interfacing of these competencies with actual job requirements. In this way, flexibility can be built into a training model that allows for the development of basic skills as well as those required by different sites and job descriptions.

This background information from the original proposal submitted to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped established the need for training of paraprofessionals. The project, "Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training" was funded to provide field-based inservice training for a three-year period beginning in June 1978.

OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITIES

Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training was designed to address the in-service training needs of two target groups. The primary target group was Paraprofessionals who work with young handicapped children and the secondary target group included supervising teachers or others whom paraprofessionals assist. Training was designed to meet inservice needs for each of the following systems or settings serving young handicapped children:

1. Public school Early Childhood classes for the Handicapped,
2. Public school mainstream classes for kindergarten and first grade,
3. Private child care centers/schools in which handicapped children are enrolled, and
4. Public child care centers which enroll handicapped children.

Primary emphasis was on training for aides in Public School Early Childhood classes for the handicapped and Public Child Care personnel since these are the settings in which the majority of young handicapped children are served.

During the first year of this project, previous staff work with paraprofessionals was reviewed and integrated into Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training. Through a field survey, roles and responsibilities of teachers and assistant teachers in each of the above settings were identified. Based on this information and a review of pertinent literature and materials, core competencies were identified and training sessions focusing on various topic areas of concern were designed. Inservice training, conducted in selected sites across the state, was provided for more than 800 attendees. Through 20 workshops of one-half-to-two full days each, 6,025 participant training hours were delivered during the project year ending in May 1979.

During the second year of the project paraprofessional competencies were reviewed and revised by the project Advisory Board, project staff and key site personnel. Thirty worksessions addressing these competencies were designed and training conducted in eight locations throughout the state. By the end of the second full year (May 1980) more than 1,000 persons participated in one or more training workshops. Approximately 350 persons received 16 or more hours of training and 300 persons received an average of four hours of training.

During the third year of the project the focus was on revising training content and delivery of field-based inservice with an emphasis on assisting local personnel in continuing training in the future. Thirty-five training sessions were conducted for over 1,000 participants with over 7,000 participant hours of training delivered.

Multiple teaching strategies were used throughout training (demonstrations, role play, discussion, film strips and video, simulation, minimal lecture) with print materials used only for follow-up activities. Examples of the training topic areas include: What is a Handicap?; Observing and Identifying Children in Need of Referral; Understanding parents; Talking to Learn and Learning to Talk; Language Development Through Storytelling; Behavior Problems; Adapting the Classroom; Selecting, Using, and Adapting Toys and Materials; Playground and Outdoor Activities; Infant Care; and Parent Programs.

Project evaluation included collection of demographic data on each participant and ongoing recording of specific sessions attended. Each training session (approximately 3 hours on one topic) or workshop (one-to-two days on several session topics) was evaluated for overall effectiveness and participant reaction. Depending on the specific topic, understanding of the session content was evaluated through pre-post written questionnaires, simulation or role play activities within the session, individual questioning during or after the session, or tape-recorded interviews with randomly selected participants.

Dissemination of project information has been limited to staff presentations at conferences and responses to requests for information. Because of funding cutbacks, written training session materials for distribution were not produced. However, as an outgrowth of this project and recognizing the need for written information about the handicapped child, the Texas Department of Human Resources (TDHR) contracted for the development of a procedural guide, When You Care for Handicapped Children, which is now available from TDHR.

Other accomplishments related to this project have included: incorporation of training techniques and content information on the handicapped into child development courses in a junior college site; increased awareness of the need for basic child development training and short-term contracts for such training; additional short term contracts for non-project sites with other state, regional, and local agencies or schools; and numerous requests for conference presentations on techniques used in this project for inservice training.

DESIGN OF PROJECT AND TRAINING

Consistent with current state education planning, the APT project provided training which was generic, not categorical. The project was not designed to diagnose or label children or to train paraprofessionals to do so. Identification, numbers, and types of handicapped children served was the function and responsibility of the school or center in which the children were enrolled. However, information about the number of children served was collected from local personnel and summarized for project records.

Inservice training was designed to meet local site parameters while providing paraprofessionals with the knowledge and skills for working with the handicapped children in their care. Competencies and associated training for paraprofessionals must interface with the training and tasks of supervising teachers, other supervisors, and trainers within the different systems (public and non-public schools and centers) to be effective. Therefore, competencies were developed for paraprofessionals to interface with competency clusters identified by TEA for special education teachers and those developed for Head Start and Day Care programs.

Competencies must be compatible with the job descriptions under which paraprofessionals are employed. Therefore, job descriptions were reviewed and priority training areas identified on system/site-specific bases. It was evident from these job descriptions that paraprofessional responsibilities vary in accordance with the employing institutions. Therefore, alternatives-competency training were developed to meet these differing needs.

Differences also exist in the logistical training parameters (time allocations/schedules, type/format preference, location/space availability and preference, etc.). Therefore, different approaches/arrangements were used in training. Practicum training was not included as a specific objective, because the entire training program was directed to those persons who were already in field-based settings, i.e., already employed. Feedback was continually obtained from participants and from their supervisors regarding training conducted, classroom implementation, and needs for further training. On-site observation was conducted for a sample of participants, as appropriate to the individual site. Such observation was limited because of budgetary constraints, however.

Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training was not a university-based training program, therefore, college credits or grades were not a motivational device. External motivation such as certification, career ladders, or an increase in pay were not offered by the training project as these are the inservice responsibilities of the local employing agency. In many cases paraprofessionals attending training had only partial or no compensatory time off to attend training. Therefore, it was absolutely essential for the project staff to provide training which was recognized as valuable to participants and of immediate use. It was also essential to provide training which was interesting and motivating enough for participants to return to the next sequence of training sessions.

The following points were basic to the planning and delivery of training in this project:

1. Paraprofessionals are a less homogeneous group than college-trained public school teachers, with considerable variance in their previous educational levels, training, and experience. Therefore, training was tailored to the needs of individuals as well as to the site or system in which they work.

2. Supervising teachers of paraprofessionals should be trained in effective communication with the paraprofessional, in knowledge and understanding of the paraprofessional's abilities and interests, and in observational and supervisory techniques. Therefore, training included the supervisory teacher when possible and specific training sessions focused on effective communication between teachers and aides or assistants.

3. Training must be highly motivating, meeting the interests and needs of participants. Traditional approaches of lecture and assigned reading are not compatible with the prior education and training of paraprofessionals. Therefore, a variety of other adult teaching strategies were used.

4. Evaluation of training is essential in determining whether the participants' needs are being met as well as in determining effectiveness of the training. Therefore, each training session as well as training workshops which included multiple training sessions were evaluated for effectiveness.

COMPETENCIES

Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training was competency-based, and designed to meet the working needs of employed individuals. Consequently, in addition to identification of competencies, the variables of prior training and experience, availability of training time, and job description requirements, were considered in the design and delivery of on-site training.

During the first year of the project, initial work for identifying training needs and for developing an Alternatives-Competency Model was completed, including a review and report of relevant literature and other programs focusing on paraprofessional working with young handicapped children. This information was summarized in the document, Paraprofessionals in Early Education of the Handicapped: Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography (Evans and Iscoe, 1977) and entered into the ERIC system. Competency statements from other programs and local job descriptions or requirements were reviewed. Based on this information and on Advisory Board recommendations, a survey of selected sites throughout the state was conducted, with data analysis completed during the second year. A synthesis of this information resulted in initial identification of competencies needed by paraprofessionls who work with young handicapped children. This initial review indicated a wide range of educational background (varying from completion to fourth grade through completion of an MA degree in another field), and experience (ranging from no experience to eight years). Logistical training parameters also vary greatly. Some sites require a specified number of in-service training hours or training days, while other sites make no such provision. In some sites, content for training is specified by administrative staff, while in other sites training content is generated from participants.

During the second year a report of this survey, Responsibilities and Training Needs of Paraprofessionals: A Survey of Those Who Work With Young Handicapped Children (Evans, 1980) was completed and entered into the ERIC system. Competency statements were refined, elaborated and verified through review by advisory board members, field supervisors, and head teachers. The competencies were grouped into the following areas:

I. Position Orientation

II. Interpersonal Relations

III. Basic Child Care and Management

IV. Classroom Planning and Organization

V. Classroom Instruction

A complete description of these competency areas was included in the first and second year report (Volume I). These competency statements were also reviewed by the Texas Consul for Personnel Preparation for the Handicapped, Early Childhood Task Force and appropriate parts incorporated into a proposal for certification of teachers in Texas, State Certification Requirements for Teachers of Young Children.

WORKSESSIONS

To address the identified competencies, related content information was outlined and divided into "Worksessions" logistical parameters of inservice training time at various sites and recommendations from the Advisory Board and Center Directors indicated the need to divide training periods into 2 to 4 hour time blocks. Therefore, worksessions focusing on a single topic area were designed to last approximately 3 hours each, with additional information and activities included to expand a session to 4 hours when appropriate. Each of these training sessions focused on a topic or content area related to the identified competencies.

The need for specific, action-oriented training session activities which directly related to children in the classroom rather than training which relied upon print materials, lecture or abstract and theoretical information was also identified. Therefore, each training session was designed for minimal reliance upon lecture with print materials used only as follow-up information. The sessions focused on the use of demonstration, simulation and role play, audiovisual materials, question and answer periods, and small group dicussion, with modeling of instructional techniques and interaction throughout.

In each field-based site, a survey was conducted to identify participant needs. Worksessions were then selected and combined into workshops to meet the specific needs of the local site within the available training time period. These workshops (usually one to two days in length) were planned with local supervisory personnel and conducted on-site. Each workshop included two to six worksessions, depending on the time available.

At least two and usually three such training workshops were conducted each year for each project site. Continuity of training was planned in advance with the local director of special education, program director, or other person responsible for inservice planning.

In designing training sessions to address the specific topic areas, existing materials were used, including those previously developed by SEDL staff. Additional materials have been developed as needed. Titles and a brief description of worksession topics are included in Appendix B. The specific competencies upon which training was based are included in the first and second year report, Alternatives for Paraprofessionals Training, Volume I, August, 1980 (ERIC document).

TRAINING CONDUCTED

Field-based training conducted during the first and second year of the project (June 1978 through May 1980) was described by site in the previous report (Vol. I) and is briefly summarized below. A description and summary of third year training follows.

First Year

During the first year of the project, the intention was to focus on identifying competencies, developing training sessions, and pilot testing the sessions at a local level prior to moving into wider training. However, the need for training was so great and so many requests were received, that more training was conducted during the first year than originally projected. During the first year of the project over 6,000 participant training hours were delivered for more than 800 attendees in rural and urban locations throughout the state. It should be noted that although most people participated in the entire sequence of training workshops, additional people attended select workshops as well. The project staff selected training sites as identified in the initial proposal. However, actual participants at each site were selected by the local site supervisors or directors. In most cases, the same people attended each training session. However, staff turnover among paraprofessionals means that new people are added throughout the year. During the first year, twenty training sessions were delivered and conducted at least one time.

Second Year

During the second year of the project training sessions were revised and additional ones designed to meet field identified needs. By the end of the second year, approximately 30 worksessions were designed and used in actual training. Approximately 7,500 participant contact training hours were delivered for over 1,000 attendees. To meet the requests within the Austin area, two Invitational Workshops focusing on topics related to general child growth and development, with some sessions on the handicapped, were held for private and public child care personnel.

In addition, workshops were developed for other training which was a spin-off from Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training. For example, in several locations, Title XX personnel requested training on general child growth and development as well as infant care. In addition, contracts were received from one Title XX Region which serves handicapped infants from birth through 6 to design and develop training to meet their specific needs. Although these training contracts and sessions were not a direct part of the BEH contract, they were related to, or a result of this project.

Third Year

During the third year of the project, approximately 7,200 participant contact training hours were delivered for over 1,000 attendees. To meet requests within the Austin area, an Invitational Workshop was held again. The Training Sites, Training Alternative, Number of Participants, Actual Number of Contact Hours, and Participant Training Hours are summarized in the following pages. More detailed descriptions of the actual training, including descriptions of training sites, lists of participants, descriptions of sessions, and evaluations are included in Appendix B for each site.

THIRD YEAR TRAINING

June 1980 - May 1981

SITE	TRAINING ALTERNATIVE	NO. OF PARTICIPANTS	HOURS	= PPH
Hays, Caldwell, Blanco County Head Start	Full Day Workshop August 2, 1980	17	6	102
	Full Day Workshop January 23, 1981	17	6	102
	Full Day Workshop March 13, 1981	24	6	144
	On-site Observation and Technical Assistance September 23, 1980	4	4	16
	On-site Observation and Technical Assistance October 22, 1980	5	4	20
Community Council of Central Texas	Technical Assistance June 10, 1980	1	6	6
	Half-day Workshop August 12, 1980	15	2.5	37.5
	Half-day Workshop September 18, 1980	15	2.5	37.5
	Half-day Workshop September 19, 1980	9	2.5	23.5
	Full Day Workshop December 10, 1980	32	6	192
Odessa Community College	Evening Workshop September 1980	74	4	316
	Demonstration Training for Trainers September 1980	3	4	12
	Evening Workshop February 1981	52	4	208
	Demonstration Training for Trainers February 1981	3	4	12
	Evening Workshop April 1981	109	4	436

SITE	TRAINING ALTERNATIVE	NO. OF PARTICIPANTS	HOURS	=	PPH
Odessa Community College	Demonstration Training for Trainers	3	4		12
Temple 4-C	Half-day Workshop September 1980	8	3		24
	Planning and Technical Assistance September 1980	4	3		12
	Full Day Workshop January 1981	15	6		90
Austin Invitational	Full Day Workshop October 1980	58	6		348
Abilene	Half-day Workshop August 1980	33	2.5		82.5
	Full Day Workshop March 1981	31	5		155
	Full Day Workshop January 1981	23	6		138
Child, Inc.	Full Day Workshop November 6 & 7, 1981	74	6		444
	Evening Parent Workshop October 1980	4	4		8
	Full Day Workshop January 1981	80	6		480
	Half-day Workshop February 1981	21	3		63
TMC-Wintergarten	Full Day Workshop October 1980	40	6		240
	Full Day Workshops - 2 days January 1981	55	12		660
	Full Day Workshops - 2 days March 16 & 17, 1981	71	12		852
	Half-day Training of Trainers	6	3		18
TMC-Valley	Full Day Workshops - 2 days October 1980	62	12		744
	Full Day Workshops - 2 days January 1981	68	12		816

SITE	TRAINING ALTERNATIVE	NO. OF PARTICIPANTS	HOURS	=	PPH
TME-Valley	Full Day Workshop March 1981	82	5		410
	Half-day Training of Trainers	10	2.5		25
		1,133			7,286

PPH - Per Participant Hours

Workshop - Two or more simultaneous sessions within a given time period.

Session - One topic covered for a given time period.

EVALUATION

The overall purpose of this project was to develop and deliver on-site training in working with young handicapped children for paraprofessionals and supervising teachers. Accomplishment of this purpose is evidenced by the number of persons receiving training and the number of training hours delivered. Site reports detailing delivery of training are included in this report.

The objectives of this project were also achieved. In summary these objectives and evidence of accomplishment were:

1. Identification of roles, responsibilities and competencies needed by paraprofessionals in working with handicapped children.
   Objective accomplished and documented through reports entered into the ERIC system (Evans, Responsibilities and Training Needs of Paraprofessionals: A Survey of Those Who Work With Young Handicapped Children, March, 1980).

2. Development of modular training for paraprofessionals and teacher/supervisors.
   Objectives accomplished and documented through development of over 30 specific training sessions as listed in Appendix B. Written materials for use by others were not developed because of reduction in project funds.

3. Delivery of field based inservice training.
   Objective accomplished with first and second year results reported and entered into ERIC system (Evans, Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training, Vol. I, Aug, 1980).

4. Project research and evaluation.
   Research was limited to identification of paraprofessional roles and training needs and evaluation of training. Classroom research as orginally projected was modified because of reduced project resources. Evaluation of direct training is described in the following section.

5. Dissemination of information.
   Objective accomplished within budgetary limits. Materials for replication of training by others were not developed or disseminated. Dissemination focused on written reports, articles, and presentations.

Evaluation of training sessions

Two types of data were collected to evaluate the training delivered, both were used as formative data (i.e., for improvement of training). These included session effectiveness data and criterion referenced data.

A summary of session evaluation data for each site can be found in Appendix D. For each training session, data was collected on individual forms and compiled on an evaluation summary form. The data was summarized by computing a mean rating for each item as well as an overall session effectiveness score. Samples of the forms used are included in Appendix E.

Criterion referenced tests were designed and administered to evaluate content imparted in many of the training sessions. These CRT measures were used as a pre-post session evaluation at some sites and as a post-session evaluation in other sites. The CRT approach was not successful, however. Participants were uncomfortable in taking a "test" even though it was explained that the purpose of the CRT measure was to provide information for improving future sessions. Many participants had difficulty in writing answers to questions; some participants had difficulty in reading the questions; other participants conferred with each other in order to get the "right" answer. In general, administration of the CRT measures as a pre-session measure set a negative tone for the session. Also, the CRT approach consumed training time which was more effectively used in actual training. Therefore, CRT evaluation was dropped from training sessions.

As an alternative, in two sites local supervisors were asked to interview participants and tape record their responses at the end of training. Questions such as "Has this training helped you? How? Will you use the ideas/information in your classroom? Which ones?" were asked. This approach was more effective than written evaluation but did not yield results which could be clearly tallied and summarized.

Classroom observation was proposed in the original proposal as a means of evaluating teacher changes related to training. In all sites project staff observed in the classrooms at least once and in some sites, multiple observations were conducted. These observations were of definite value in developing training but of less value for evaluation of change related to training. Some training sessions (such as those which focused on parents) did not cover content which could be observed in the classroom. Other sessions (such as those on behavior or communication) focused on content which could not always be observed during the scheduled observations. Some sessions (such as selecting and using materials) did afford observable classroom changes in teacher behavior, teacher-child interaction or child behavior. However project resources did not permit the quality and extent of observation necessary for collection of valid data.

In retrospect, the evaluation design initially proposed was not realistic for a field-based training program. Administration of criterion referenced tests as pre-post knowledge measures intimidated participants to the extent of affecting receptiveness to training. Classroom observation did not yield enough data to even report. Measures of session effectiveness were improved over time and did provide useful data.

Session effectiveness forms were prepared prior to delivery of training. However, a tabulation system was not designed until the end of the first year. As the process of tabulation was begun it was discovered that the format of some of the questions did not lend themselves to statistical tabulation. Other questions apparently were ambiguous in their wording and resulted in unrelated responses. As a result, the session evaluation forms were redesigned to incorporate a numerical rating system and provide easier tabulation and analysis.

Recommendations for future projects would include a reevaluation of all forms after the first quarter. The format of the questions should be reviewed to determine ease of statistical tabulation. An item analysis should be performed and inappropriate questions eliminated or reworded.

Although evaluation questions which elicit specific comments or suggested changes do not lend themselves to tabulation they are valuable to trainers in refining session content. For this reason questions which solicit written comments should be included in content evaluations.

DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES

Budgetary constraints limited dissemination activities, particularly during the third year of the APT project. In the original proposal, the budget line item for development of training materials was disapproved. Second and third year requests for restoring this budget item were not approved. Consequently, there were no written training materials to disseminate. Dissemination focused only on providing information to others about the project through conference presentations, entry of reports into the ERIC system and related articles.

During the first two years of the project, dissemination activities included conference presentations for the National Council for Exceptional Children, the Texas Council for Exceptional Children, and Texas Association for the Education of Young Children, bi-annual meetings of Regional Service Center directors in Texas, Teaching Texas Tots, and other local presentations. A statewide announcement of the project was carried in the newsletters of the Texas Office of Early Childhood Development and the Texas Mental Health and Mental Retardation Agency. During the second year, a description of the APT project was included in the R&D information Exchange reaching the six states served by SEDL. Project staff also conducted a two-day workshop on the handicapped child for selected key state education personnel as a part of the R&D Regional Exchange Program. A total of twenty nine presentations about, or related to, the project were presented in the first two years.

Third year dissemination activities included national and state level conference presentations, responses to individual requests, submission of reports into the ERIC system and publication of articles as listed on the following page.

As a result of these dissemination activities as well as informal communication about the training provided, a number of additional requests for training were received. The field requests, particularly those which occurred as a result of informal communication, clearly reinforces the identified need for practical, applied level training of paraprofessionals as well as training for professionals. Numerous requests were received for inservice training of college degreed, public school teachers, a target group not included in this project.

A major problem was the lack of funds for developing written training materials which could be used by others independently of the project staff. If there is to be a continuing benefit of inservice training projects beyond the duration of the project grant, provision of funds for producing and disseminating written materials is a necessity.

Staff presentations, articles, and documents entered into the ERIC system are listed on the following pages.

STAFF PRESENTATIONS

"Captivating Classroom." Little Rock ISD, Little Rock, Arkansas, May, 1981. (Evans)

"Designing a Toddler Environment" Tender Loving Care for Children, Victoria, Texas. May 1981. (Bricker)

"Working With Parents of Mexican American Children." National Conference on The Exceptional Bilingual Child. New Orleans, Louisiana, February 1981. (Evans)

"Using Materials with Special Children" Curriculum and Instruction Course, University of Texas. Austin, Texas. February 1981. (Bricker)

"Practical Approaches to Materials in the Bilingual Mainstreamed Setting" Bilingual Conference Council for Exceptional Children. New Orleans, LA February 1981. (Bricker)

"Training Services Available." Teaching Texas Tots, Austin, Texas. March 1981. (Evans)

"Working With Parents of Handicapped Children." Project Sunrise, Eastern Montana College, March 1981. (Evans)

"Effective Inservice." HCEEP-DEC Conference, Washington, D.C., December 1980. (Evans)

"Infant Massage" Austin Association for Infant Mental Health. Austin, Texas December 1980. (Bricker)

"Working With Parents of the Handicapped." Texas Council for Exceptional Children Conference. Dallas, Texas. August 1980. (Grace)

"Materials for Use in the Mainstreamed Preschool." Texas Association for the Education of Young Children. Laredo, Texas. October 1980. (Grace)

"Sensory-Motor Activities for Tots and Preschoolers." Texas Association for the Education of Young Children. Laredo, Texas. October 1980. (Bricker)

"It's More Than Counting: Math for 4's and 5's." Conference for the Advancement of Mathematics Teaching. Austin, Texas. October 1980. (Grace, Bricker)

"Creating a Captivating Classroom." Region IV Education Service Center, Houston, Texas. October 1980. (Evans)

"From Objective to Activity in Kindergarten." Bilingual Communication Skills Conference. Austin, Texas. August 1980. (Bricker)

"Early Childhood, An Alternative Educational Market." Association of Media Producers Conference. St. Charles, Illinois. June 9, 1980. (Evans)

"Early Childhood in the 1980's." Early Childhood Summer Institute, Corpus Christi, Texas. June 1980. (Evans)

"Mainstreaming in Early Childhood." Early Childhood Institute. Richardson, Texas June 1980. (Bricker)

"Learning Through Play." Early Childhood Summer Institute, Richardson, Texas June 1980. (Evans)

"Easy Science Activities for the Preschool." Austin Association for the Education of Young Children. Austin, Texas. May 1980. (Grace)

Working With Mexican American Parents of Handicapped Children. International Council for Exceptional Children Convention. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. April 1980. (Evans, Grace)

"Training Paraprofessionals." Texas Developmental Disabilities Conference, Dallas, Texas. April 1980. (Grace)

"Training Paraprofessionals." International Council for Exceptional Children Convention, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. April 1980. (Grace, Bricker)

Session Leader. The Unfulfilled Promise: Conference on Understanding Perinatal Grief and Disappointment. March of Dimes. Austin, Texas. April 1980. (Evans)

Working with Parents. First Annual Conference, Parents and Professionals: A Team Approach to Working with the Special Student. Abilene, Texas. April 1980. (Evans)

"Behavior Problems." and "Easy Science Activities." San Marcos Association for the Education of Young Children. San Marcos, Texas. April 1980. (Whitworth)

"Learning Through the Senses." Dallas Association for the Education of Young Children. Dallas, Texas. February 1980 (Bricker)

"Training Needs of Infant Caregivers: What to Talk About." Triple T Consortium Conference. Dallas, Texas. February 1980. (Grace)

"Teaching Toddlers." Annual Conference, Austin Association for the Education of Young Children. Austin, Texas. February 1980. (Grace)

"Activities for Infants." Annual Conference - Austin Association for the Education of Young Children, Austin, Texas. February 1980. (Whitworth)

"The Art of Mainstreaming." Austin Association for the Education of Young Children. Austin, Texas. February 1980. (Bricker)

"Storytelling for Infants and Toddlers." Association for Education of Young Children Conference. Austin, Texas. February 1980. (Evans)

"When You Care for Handicapped Children." Teaching Texas Tots Conference. Dallas, Texas. Janaury 1980. (Evans)

"Training Needs of Infant Caregivers." Teaching Texas Tots Conference. Dallas, Texas. January 1980. (Bricker, Grace)

"Communicating with Children." Austin Council for Exceptional Children. Austin, Texas. January 1980. (Grace)

"Training Paraprofessionals." Texas Association of Child Care Workers. Austin, Texas. November 1979. (Bricker)

"Art in the Preschool Classroom" Child Care Course for Austin Association for the Education of Young Children. Austin, Texas. November 1979. (Grace)

"Toy Tales" Austin's Celebration of the International Year of the Child. Austin, Texas. November 1979. (Bricker, Grace, Evans, Whitworth)

"Science in the Mainstream Classroom" Child Care Course for Austin Association for the Education of Young Children. Austin, Texas. November 1979. (Bricker)

"Working With Parents" Teacher Training Conference, Brownsville, Texas. November 1979. (Evans)

"Behavior and Preschoolers" Austin Natural Science Association. October 1979. (Evans)

R&D Speaks: Special Education in K-3rd Grade. Austin, Texas. September 1979. (Evans, Bricker, Grace)

Conference Summary - Panelist; The Second Texas Infancy Conference. Austin, Texas. June 1979. (Evans)

"Understanding the Family of the Terminally Ill Child" Early Childhood Special Education Inservice. Richardson, Texas. May 1979. (Evans)

Young Handicapped Children and the Paraprofessional, National Council on Training and Utilization of Paraprofessionals. Austin, Texas. April 1979. (Evans)

"Practical Approaches, Materials and Activities for Mainstreaming Young Handicapped Children" CEC Institute, 57th International Convention, Council for Exceptional Children.. Dallas, Texas. April 1979. (Bricker)

Paraprofessionals in Early Childhood Settings, 57th International Convention, Council for Exceptional Children. Dallas, Texas. April 1979. (Evans)

"Teaching Children with Language Problems" Austin Association for the Education of Young Children. Austin, Texas. February 1979. (Bricker)

ARTICLES

Evans, J. Inservice Training for the 1980's. Journal of the Division for Early Childhood. Spring, 1981.

Evans, J. Parent Pipeline: Encouage Creativity, Try an Art Box. The PTA Communicator. April, 1981, 59:4.

Evans, J. Survey of Responsibilities and Training Needs of Paraprofessional Who Work with Young Children with Handicaps. New Directions Newsletter, City University of New York, New Careers Training Laboratory, Winter 1981

Evans, J. How to Select Your Child's Toys. The PTA Communicator, November 1980, 58:9.

Evans, J. "Communicating with Parents of Handicapped Children" in: R&D Speaks: Special Education, Conference Proceedings. Austin, Texas: SEDL, Regional Exchange, (211 East Seventh Street) 1980.

ERIC DOCUMENTS

Evans, J. Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training, Volume I, First and Second Year Report. Office of Special Education Project No. 451 BH 00022, August, 1980.

Evans, J. and Stewart, P. Toy Preference and Safety Knowledge: A Pilot Survey of Teachers of Young Children. March, 1980. (ED 191 593).

Evans, J. and Stewart, P. Toys--More Than Trifles for Play: A Review of the Toy Industry, Educational Claims, Safety Standards, Toy Selection and Toy Libraries. March, 1980. 83 pgs. (ED 192 884).

Evans, J. Responsibilities and Training Needs of Paraprofessionals: A Survey of Those Who Work with Young Handicapped Children. March, 1980. 64 pgs. (ED 191 193: EC 124 523).

Evans, J. and Newman, Y. Resource List and Annotated Bibliography for Working with Parents of Handicapped Children. January, 1980. 89 pgs. (ED 182 941; EC 123 189).

OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS

As a direct result result of project activities and staff experience the Texas Department of Human Resources (TDHR) contracted with the Special Projects Division for the development and publication of a procedural guide for Title XX Child Care providers. When You Care for Handicapped Children and 24 related pamphlets are now available from TDHR. Consultant review was provided by special education personnel of the Texas Education Agency (TEA), possible ways for public schools and day care to integrate services has been included in the guide. Also, interagency agreements are now under development between TEA and TDHR. Thus, the Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training project has stimulated the potential for long term effects and more effective services for handicapped children.

Contracted Training

Only a limited number of sites receive direct services under the Alternatives for Paraprofessional Training grant. However, during the second year the training sessions and staff experience developed under this grant were utilized by other sites which contracted for similar training. Knowledge of the training spread primarily by word-of-mouth -- participants recommended training to other groups. Examples of short-term training contracts during the second year included:

- Victoria, Texas - Tender Loving Care Infant Center for Handicapped Infants
- Laredo, Texas - Ruth B. Cowl Rehabilitation Center
- Panhandle Area - Texas Migrant Council
- Costal Bend Area - Texas Migrant Council
- Victoria, Texas - Education Service Center
- Richardson, Texas - Education Service Center
- Houston, Texas - Education Service Center

During the third year training contracts included:

- Corpus Christi, Texas - Education Service Center
- Houston, Texas - Education Service Center
- Lufkin, Texas - Deep East Texas MHMR
- Mt. Pleasant, Texas - Education Service Center
- Waco, Texas - Education Service Center
- Austin, Texas - Education Service Center

. Austin, Texas - Texas Department of Community Affairs

. Abilene, Texas - Abilene Independent School District

. Abilene Texas - Day Nursery of Abilene, Inc.

. Amarillo, Texas - Education Service Center

. Midland, Texas - Education Service Center

. Snyder, Texas - Synder Independent School District

. Laredo, Texas - Laredo Junior College

. Plainview, Texas - South Plains Junior College

. San Antonio, Texas - Texas Migrant Council

. Robstown, Texas - Texas Migrant Council

. Odessa, Texas - United Day Care Systems

. Big Spring, Texas - Westside Community Day Care Center

. Dallas, Texas - University of Texas at Dallas

. Alexandria, Louisiana - Louisiana State Department of Education

. Little Rock, Arkansas - Little Rock Public Schools

SUGGESTIONS TO OTHERS

The objectives and activities of this project have been thoroughly described in previous sections. However, this report would not be complete without an informal description of what has been learned and in turn, suggestions to others which might be of help for projects of a similar nature.

This section of the report is written in a less formal manner. Hard facts and figures are not cited, as the information is a synthesis of what we have learned. It includes three sections:

1. An overview summary of the types of sites in which training was conducted, specific issues related to these sites and how these were handled.

2. A discussion of common issues and problems related to in-service in general and their relationship to this project.

3. A listing of points to consider and general impressions regarding the project, which may help others.

Summary of sites

The purpose of this project was to provide on-site service training for sites representing the various alternative settings in which handicapped children are served. The various site models included:

*Public School District Training: Local school districts hired substitutes for the aides in Early Childhood classrooms for the Handicapped to attend a series of one-day workshops. However, after the first few workshops, teachers insisted upon attending also. At the request of teachers, training dates were changed to match district-wide inservice days. Thus, during the second and third years in most of the public school sites teachers as well as aides attended the same training.

*Regional Educational Service Center Training: Public school aides from several scattered rural districts were given release time to attend training and continuity was excellent. Again, teachers insisted on receiving the same training. However, the different districts in the region did not have the same inservice dates. This presented a definite problem with continuity in attendance.

*College/Child care personnel training: This was a dual level model in which both college instructors and child care staff received training. Sequences of workshops were conducted in the evening by APT project staff for private and public child care personnel. The College staff observed and assisted with these workshops in order to incorporate similar training into their course curriculum. Prior to and following the workshops, informational sessions were held with the college personnel who were given additional background information. This resulted in the development and inclusion of a course, "The Special Child" within their Child Development Associate degree program.

*Supervisor/Teacher Training: Dual level training was also provided for the Texas Migrant Council(TMC) which is a Head Start agency serving over 1,500 rural migrant children throughout the state. This model included intensive week-long workshops in three locations before Centers opened in the Fall, followed by a series of two-day workshops. In these workshops classroom personnel received training for one and one-half days followed by a half-day of training for supervisors. The Head Teachers and supervisors remained constant over the last two years but the turnover among teachers totalled about 40 percent. It became necessary to conduct two levels of training for teachers, a beginning level for new teachers and an advanced level for returnees.

*Urban Day Care Training: Conducted in Austin for teacher, aides and center directors, participants were selected by their central agency on the basis of length of time of employment. Continuity in attendance has been very high.

*Center Level Training: This training was conducted for two Head Start Centers located close to Austin. In this model group training was conducted in the afternoons. In the mornings project staff observed in the classrooms and provided assistance to individual teachers on working with specific children. This model was highly individualized.

Common issues and problems of inservice

Issues or problems often cited by other project directors or in the literature on teacher-inservice, had varying degrees of impact on the APT project. These issues included:

Scheduling - release time for training or extra pay for overtime

Credentialling - recognition of training or career-building and promotion

Motivation - how to get people to attend inservice and learn from it

Participation - getting people involved and interested in training

Evaluation - assessing training effectiveness, teacher change and child change.

Scheduling was a concern, but not a problem. The APT project staff scheduled training to meet the dates and hours available locally. Public school training was either scheduled on a district-wide inservice day or the local administration hired substitutes to release teachers and aides for training. Some non-public school sites simply closed their child care centers in order for the entire staff to attend training. It was not unusual to have cooks and secretaries as well as teachers and aides present. This was viewed positively by the APT staff since in child care centers, all adults interact with children and non-teaching staff had the opportunity to learn about children learning in the classroom. In other child care sites, the same training was repeated in the morning and afternoon on consecutive days as only half the staff could be released for training at

a single time. In one site, training was scheduled from 6:00 to 10:00 in the evening because participants did not have paid-release time. Thus, the issue of release time and scheduling was addressed by the APT staff adapting to locally available time periods.

Credentialling was not a project responsibility or issue. All participants were employed according to locally established qualifications. Certification was also a local matter. In some sites (Day Care, Head Start), teachers were required or encourgaged to earn their Child Development Associate (CDA) credential or an Associates Arts degree. In many instances participants in APT training asked if they could use the ideas and handouts in building their CDA portfoloio or as a part of course-projects. Such requests were considered a positive response to and use of APT training. APT staff provided additional information as requested through informal conferencing while on site and by telephone. In the public schools, all teachers were degreed and certified. Requirements for teacher-aides was a local decision. A specified number of hours of inservice training was required of all public school personnel with APT training meeting this requirement.

Motivation has been partially addressed under credentialling and scheduling. For some participants local requirements for attending in-service was a motivator, but not necessarily a positive one. Because the APT project did not offer college credit or credentials it was necessary to provide training which was motivating in and of itself. It was the responsibility of each staff trainer to conduct training which was interesting and enjoyable, as well as informative. A sincere attitude of being guests on site, responsible for meeting the practical needs and concerns of participants and serving as an information resource, as opposed to an external expert dispersing knowledge was a critical factor. This attitude was intentionally planned and practiced by the APT staff trainers. Through informal conversation and introductory activities the APT staff made a point of meeting and talking individually with as many people as possible. This approach was noticed and commented on by many participants. The large return rate, particularly at sites where attendance was voluntary and in addition to the regular work-day, indicated that participants were pleased with training and motivated to return. In one case a participant had attended sessions in Austin, moved to Odessa and requested release time from her new job to attend sessions conducted in Odessa.

Participation was not a problem. All training was designed to maximize involvement and participation. Minimal reliance was placed on passive learning (lecture or audio-visuals). It was clearly recognized that all participants were adults with a range of prior experience and knowledge to contribute and that ultimately participants should serve as resources to each other in their areas of strength. Thus, it was incumbant upon APT staff to identify and recognize the knowledge and skills of participants and to encourage them to recognize each other as resources. A variety of adult instructional strategies such as discussion, brainstorming, role play and simulation were utilized in training. All sessions included at least one activity in which participants worked together. (See Evans, Inservice Training for the 1980's, Journal of the Division for Early Childhood, Council for Exceptional Children, 1981 for additional information)

Evaluation definitely was a problem and one which was not clearly resolved. Prior to training, potential participants had input into the specific topics to be covered via a needs assessment survey. At the end of each training session participants were also asked to list or describe other types of training which would be of help to them. Each session was evaluated for effectiveness in holding interest, conveying content and the extent to which participants felt they would use the information (See section on evaluation for additional information and Appendix E for evaluation form samples). To evaluate session content, initially Criterion Referenced Tests (CRT's) were developed and given before and after each session. The pre-test was dropped because it set a negative tone for the training session and the use of CRT's for post-session evaluation was reduced as well. A satisfactory means of evaluating knowledge gain or teacher change was not achieved.

Points to Consider

As described in the previous section, this project did not have a "captive" audience of students enrolled in course work and working toward credits or a degree. Other external motivators such as required credentialling or career development were not available. All participants were mature adults, employed on a full-time basis, often attending training on a volunteer basis. Thus, it was the responsibility of the project staff to provide training which was interesting, addressed participants needs, captured and held attention, and left participants with the desire to return to the next training workshop. The following points guided this project and are points for others to consider.

Training must include a variety of adult instructional strategies. Participants must be actively involved in identifying their own training needs initially and throughout training sessions. Lecture and use of audiovisuals are passive instructional strategies which should be used as little as possible. Active learning strategies such as discussion, role play, simulations, individual activities or projects, are more effective.

Training itself, not just the content to be conveyed, is critical. The design of actual training - that is, time the trainer spends face-to-face with the participants - must be well conceived, planned, coordinated, and executed. Successful training requires detailed preparation - a lot of it. It also requires rehearsal until every aspect flows smoothly.

Preparing for Training requires time. In preparing a single training session of only two to three hours, we often spent two to three weeks in determining the most critical ideas to be conveyed, simplifying concepts to their very essence, identifying the most appropriate and efficient techniques, developing specific activities and materials, role-playing and reworking a session. It is very important to schedule time for careful preparation

Field based training must be highly efficient. There is neither time nor money for reinforcement through repetition over time. Participants must understand and remember concepts presented in training and be able to use them the next day. It is in the classroom that concepts are reinforced when the teacher successfully implements a new idea - not through repetitious training or independent reading.

Expertise in content knowledge is not enough. Content expertise does not necessarily make a good trainer. The trainer must understand and be able to use a variety of specific training skills. The trainer must model educational techniques which should be used in the classroom. The old adage "Do as I say, not what I do" defeats training. The trainers must train the same way teachers should teach.

The local site contact person is a critical link. Field based training cannot be accomplished successfully without the assistance of a local contact person. This person is usually responsible for obtaining training space, necessary equipment, and refreshments. The local contact usually decides who will attend training. It is also more efficient for this person to send out notices of training. When training notices are sent from a non-local address (i.e., the training project), difficulties arise in responding to specific informational requests. It is important to be sensitive to the needs of the local contact person and to promptly provide any needed information (such as equipment needs, space arrangements, descriptions of workshops or training agendas) well in advance. Field based training often requiers telephone contacts with the site person. The trainer should follow up telephone conversations with a written letter to avoid any miscommunication.

The attitude of the trainer is critical. The trainer must feel that each participant is important and fully capable of learning. The trainer must be sensitive to needs, knowledge, and abilities of the participants and adjust or adapt training to help the participants. It is the responsibility of the trainer to change. It is totally unacceptable for the trainer to say "Well, they just didn't understand because they don't have the background". The trainer must sincerely believe it is his/her responsibility to simplify and adapt information so it can be learned.

This is a lot of work for a trainer. It requires a positive supportive attitude toward others, adaptability, knowledge and skills in training in addition to content knowledge. It also requires the willingness to constantly analyze ones own strengths and weaknesses and work toward improvement.

Is it worth all this effort? Is it successful? Yes, definitely. Success in training is more than simply receiving back a positive rating on an evaluation form or correct answers to a series of questins.

SUCCESS IS --when the participants go back to their schools or centers and conduct their own training for those who were not present.

--when participants urge others to attend.

--when participants walk out the door saying "I know I can..."

--when directors or supervisors telephone training staff and say they are surprised at changes in the classroom.

--when professional teachers request and even demand to attend training designed for paraprofessionals.

--when people get up at 4:00 a.m. in the morning to drive into a workshop or request evening and weekend training.

--when you observe teachers helping and working with handicapped children more effectively.

--when participants ask, "can I write the President so you can come out here more often?"

APPENDIX A

UNSOLICITED LETTERS AND COMMENTS ON TRAINING

It is a rewarding and unexpected surprise when training participants take time to write a letter of appreciation. Following each session, written questionnaires are completed by participants, and this data, including comments on session effectiveness, is summarized. However, personal letters such as those which follow provide an unsolicited measure of effectiveness.

A Very Special Thanks

from the

SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED
JUL 24 1980

EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER
REGION 10

July 11, 80

Dear Dr. Evans,

What a delightful and enthusiastic speaker you are! On behalf of the Early Childhood Institute Staff, I would like to thank you for participating in our workshop. The teachers gained much information and appreciated the personal touch you added. Your handouts will be very useful. Thank you for helping to make the workshop a success.

Very truly yours,
Cynthia Henderson
Early Childhood
Consultant

Texas Department of Human Resources

P. O. Box 767
Nacogdoches, TX 75961
June 18, 1980

JEROME CHAPMAN
Commissioner

BOARD MEMBERS

HILMAR G. MOORE
Chairman, Richmond

JAMIE H. CLEMENTS
Temple

RAUL JIMENEZ
San Antonio

Mary Grace, Trainer
Special Projects Division
Southwest Educational Laboratory
211 East 7th St.
Austin, TX 78701

Dear Mary:

I would like to thank you again for the excellent training you provided for our region June 3-6, 1980. I have received many positive comments from caregivers and directors that the training was very applicable and helpful. One caregiver stated that it was the best training she had ever received. Linda and I have requested that the "Using Materials" and the Language and Physical Movement sessions be duplicated by our Lamar trainers. They may be contacting you for assistance. Again, thanks for a job very well done. Your enthusiasm is incredible!

Also, I have received formal acceptance from the School of Social Work. I look forward to seeing you during my stay in Austin.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Melvin
Child Development Specialist

SM/rm

RECEIVED
JUN 20 1980
SPECIAL PROJECTS

An Equal Opportunity Employer

ST. BERNARD PARISH SCHOOL BOARD

EAST CHALMETTE CIRCLE AND LACOSTE STREET
CHALMETTE, LOUISIANA 70043
AREA CODE 504 271-2533

OFFICERS OF THE BOARD:
JOHN R. LANE
PRESIDENT
AUGUST A. ROBIN
VICE-PRESIDENT
BUFORD F. JONES
SUPERINTENDENT AND
SECRETARY-TREASURER

MEMBERS:
ALBERT J. AVENEL
ROUTE 1, BOX 867
ST. BERNARD, LA. 70085
GEORGE J. BOOS
2313 PACKENHAM DRIVE
CHALMETTE, LA. 70043
MARTIN CAMPO
2008 ESTEBAN STREET
ARABI, LA. 70032
FLOYD J. LANDRY
2028 MARGARET LANE
MERAUX, LA. 70075
JOHN R. LANE
208 CASA CALVO STREET
CHALMETTE, LA. 70043
ARTHUR S. LIUZZA
66 THORNTON DRIVE
CHALMETTE, LA. 70043
ROBERT J. MICHEL
2404 PLAZA DRIVE
CHALMETTE, LA. 70043
HILLARY J. NUNEZ
5600 E. ST. BERNARD HIGHWAY
VIOLET, LA. 70092
LEON PERNICIARO
815 MEHLE AVENUE
ARABI, LA. 70032
KENNETH J. RABALAIS
2609 JEAN LAFITTE PARKWAY
CHALMETTE, LA. 70043
AUGUST A. ROBIN
2220 FLAMINGO DRIVE
ST. BERNARD, LA. 70085

September 9, 1980

Ms. Connie De Luna
Teacher Trainer
Southwest Education Development Laboratory
Special Project Division
211 East Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78704

Dear Ms. De Luna:

I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks to you for serving as a Consultant during our recent In-Service Program. Your time and efforts spent with our Special Education teachers were greatly appreciated. The sharing of your expertise in this area was very meaningful.

We have received excellent feedback from our teachers and coordinators which is indicative of the program's productivity. From all indications, this has been one of our best workshops. Enclosed is a check for your expenses. Please let us know if this is not accurate.

Again, thanks for your help and we look forward to sharing ideas with you in the future.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Scafidel
Curriculum Coordinator

RJS:psr

Enclosure

RECEIVED
SEP 15 1980
SPECIAL PROJECTS

44

713, 8[illegible]-[illegible]
842-3295 (hm) 6/6/80

Dear Ms. Grace,

It has been a long time since I participated in a workshop that was as interesting and as informative as this one has been. You really got down to the "nitty gritty" smile. Seriously though, I do not regret a minute spent in the workshop. Thank you, and remember no matter where you go or to whom you speak you have it together so spread it around. God Bless you
Joyce Barker.

August 13, 1980

Dear Donna, Joyce, and Mary Grace,

I just wanted to thank you all again for your fantastic, useful, practical, and motivating summer workshop on ECH for the handicapped. It was worth more to me than any college course in that each presentation of theory was realized through your presentation of actual materials and your demonstrations of how to use them in the classroom.

I realize that it may seem like this letter has been a long time in coming, but I have been busy! I now have completed my own pocket

work organizer, volcano, body-image pouches, weather-song props, and gathering many Everyday Task materials. I am now working on my interview forms and parent involvement forms for my up-coming before school parent conferences.

Thanks again!

Sincerely
Suzanne Boyer

RECEIVED
AUG 15 1990
SPECIAL PROJECTS

August, 1980

Dr. Dr. Evans

As a student in Glenna Wade's Special Instructional Media Course at U.T. in the Fall 1979 we visited your serviced center. I was very pleased in the spring during my student teaching semester in the primary resource room when I set up a learning center based on an idea from your center. I set up a display of print and non-print containers and drew the boundary line so that the students were free to experiment with the containers and then place them back in the correct spot.

I plan to take a graduate course in Handicapped Children to [illegible] a graduate course in reading instruction. We are now using "common language" to explain some valuable information about special education.

Mary Greenberg
510 Blackwell
Knoxville, Tn.
(713
79 : 7941) 17096
18 Graduate Student
in Reading at U. of Knox.

APPENDIX B

WORKSESSIONS

WORK SESSION DESCRIPTIONS

Each of the following work sessions are designed for a 2½ to 3 hour time period with a minimum of 25 participants. Various combinations of work sessions may be sequenced to address local site needs in workshops of one to five days.

The following titles and summary descriptions provide an overview of sessions developed to date:

INTRODUCTION TO WORKING WITH THE HANDICAPPED

_____What is a Handicap?

Simulations, learning centers, and "hand-on" activities are used to introduce teachers to handicapping conditions.

_____Observing and Identifying Children in Need of Referral

Activities that help teachers sharpen their observation skills and spot children with developing problems are emphasized.

_____Auditory Problems

An in-depth session on the child with hearing impairments. Identification procedures, referral and testing, and classroom activities are included.

_____Teaching Children with Language Problems

This session looks at language activities and techniques that structure language learning for the child who is delayed.

_____Teaching the Hard-to-Teach Child

Children who have trouble learning in the regular preschool respond to learning experiences when the teacher uses specific skills and techniques designed for young children who are developmentally delayed. This session looks at things the teacher can do to assist these children.

_____Teaching the Child with Emotional Problems

The focus on this session is to provide information about the child with emotional problems such as: (1) the definition of emotional disturbances, (2) techniques or procedures for dealing with the behaviors and, (3) materials and activities that can be used in the classroom.

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

_____The Art of Mainstreaming

A "how to" worksession. Designed to give practical suggestions for adapting the preschool learning environment for young handicapped children.

_____Behavior Problems

A humanistic approach to intervening and preventing behavior problems. This session sets the foundation for understanding more formalized behavior management systems.

_____Creating a Captivating Classroom

A child's view of the classroom reveals the importance of organization and learning centers which capture and hold interest. Inexpensive ideas for improving the classroom environment are demonstrated.

_____The Teaching Team

The session focuses on developing communication and planning skills between teachers and aides in order to enhance productivity in the classroom.

CLASSROOM MATERIALS

_____Introducing Classroom Materials: The Very Beginning

It's easy to put materials on the shelves but how do you get children to use materials and learn from their activity? In this session, special focus is placed on teaching handicapped children how to work through activities.

_____Selecting, Using and Adapting Materials

A session developed to help teachers evaluate the materials they are using in the classroom. What skills are required to work with a material? What skills can be practiced with that material? How can the material be adapted? These are just a few of the questions addressed in this session.

_____Materials for the Young Handicapped Child

A sensory approach to designing, adapting, and sequencing materials is advocated. This session looks at developing sensory abilities and perceptual skills thorugh well planned activities and interest centers.

MOTOR DEVELOPMENT

____Moving to Learn

Movement is necessary for the young child. This session explores the many ways movement activities can become a part of the mainstream classroom.

____Games for the Mainstreamed Classroom

All children enjoy and learn from the social experience of playing games. It is important for the handicapped child to be a part of gaming. This session looks at gaming for all children.

____Playground and Outdoor Activities

This session focuses on how to increase effective use of the play area, the causes of playground accidents, activities that can be done on the playground and how they can be adapted for the handicapped child.

____Flexing, Stretching, and Relaxing

An Active session! Emphasis is placed on the importance of exercise and relaxation in the mainstreamed classroom.

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

____Communicating with Children

Adults influence children's behavior thorugh the language they use. This session explores principles of communication that help shape children's behavior without being hurtful.

____Talking to Learn and Learning to Talk

Language development can be enhanced if teachers understand the fundamentals of language learning. A working definition of language and specific techniques for implementing language activities are presented.

____Listening to Learn

Listening is a learned skill. In the special child it is critical that teachers understand the importance of creating an environment for listening and developing activities that augment listening skills.

____Storytelling

The focus of this session is on defining the language, determining the story level of the children and considering factors when selecting books for children.

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (continued)

_____The Bilingual/Bicultural Child

This session is an introduction to the bilingual/bicultural child and how that child learns a second language, as well as an examination of differences in the production of English and Spanish sounds. Group participation is used to teach activities to encourage the use of the second language.

ARTS AND SCIENCE

_____Art for the Young Handicapped Child

A session full of art activities for the handicapped child is supplemented with information on adapting art utensils and developing creativity. A presentation on the art center as an independent learning experience for the young child is included.

_____Drama and Puppets

Drama activities that open handicapped children to their feelings and presented. Tips for setting up the drama center also is included.

_____Music for the Handicapped Child

Music aids the young child in learning. The basics of using music in the classroom are discussed and demonstrated. Teaching children songs, choosing records for listening and using rhythm instruments are all considered.

_____Easy Science Activities

This is a fun session for teachers who feel uncomfortable with science. The very basics are presented. Easy to find and readily accessible materials form the basis of this session.

_____Science in the Mainstreamed Classroom

Setting up the science cneter for independent learning is the main focus. Adapting science activities so all children can participate is included.

WORKING WITH INFANTS AND TODDLERS

_____Infant Care

The basics of infant care -- feeding, diapering, bathing are demonstrated. Special handling techniques for the special infant are included. Tending the ill child is also addressed.

WORKING WITH INFANTS AND TODDLERS (continued)

____Understanding Infants

An explanation of infant development from a sensory model. Lots of infant activities included.

____Teaching Toddlers

Toddlers are a very special group demanding attention, affection, and consistency. Strategies for designing a toddler's day and working through the issues of that age are developed in the session.

____Activities for Infants and Toddlers

A session full of mateirals and activities that intrique, delight, and teach very young children. Special children can be included in all the fun when a few adaptations are made to accomodate their needs.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

____Parents Are Our Best Resources

Parental involvement in the preschool is an asset to the children, the teacher, and the parent, but it does require teacher planning. This session looks at possible parent involvement programs.

____Understanding Parents of Handicapped Children

Parents are the crucial link in providing consistently for the needs of their children. Teachers who can understand the special problems, needs and joys of parents with handicapped children will be more effective in designing a total educational program.

APPENDIX C

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION

Certificate of Recognition

Presented to

_____

by

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

Austin, Texas

for completion of ___ hours of training

in the following workshops

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

Date Dr. Joyce Evans, Director
Special Projects Division

APPENDIX D

SITE REPORT/SUMMARIES

SITE REPORT KEY

Type of Facility

HS - Head Start
JC - Junior College
NR - No Response
PbDC - Public Day Care
PrDC - Private Day Care
PrS - Private School
PS - Public School

Number of Participants

C - Consultants
CD - Center Director
CK - Cook
EC - Education Coordinator
ED - Educational Diagnostician
HA - Health Aide
HC - Handicap Coordinator
HS - Handicap Specialist
HT - Head Teacher
MHC - Mental Health Coordinator
N - Nurse
NR - No Response
P - Parent
PC - Parent Coordinator
PD - Program Director
S - Student
SEC - Secretary
SED - Special Education Director
SUP - Supervisor
SW - Social Worker
V - Volunteer
- * Other

Number of Children

# of C - Number of children in referral

# of HC - Number of handicapped children served

SITE REPORT SUMMARY

SITE: Abilene, Texas

SEDL STAFF: Bricker, Evans, Grace

SITE DESCRIPTION:

Located in North-Central Texas, Abilene (pop. 103,954) is surrounded by rural towns. Training has been conducted through the Regional Service Center and the Abilene Public Schools for personnel in rural as well as urban Abilene.

Training Sessions	Date	Type of Facility	Number of Participants			Number of Children		Session Effectiveness (Average)
			Teacher	Aide	*Other	# of C in Ref.	# of HC Served	
Teaching Children With Emotional Problems	8-80	PS	28		Prin 2 C 1 SUP 1	NR	NR	**
Parent Involvement	1-81	PS	23		C 1	NR	NR	**
Handling Behavior Problems	3-81	PS	18	12	N 1 SUP 1		373	**
Communication With Children	3-81	PS	18	12	N 1 SUP 1		373	**

* Local evaluation used

Participant Comments:

8-80 None available due to local form used

1-81 " " " " " " "

3-81 (See attached)

Trainer Comments:

8-80 The training was conducted as one of a group of interest sessions that educators could attend during their beginning of school programs. Conditions were quite crowded which made it difficult to do group participation activities. Despite limited space participants were very active including the few principals and counselors who were a little reticent at first.

1-81
and
3-81 The training was hosted by the Educational Service Center for Early Childhood Handicap public school teachers. Training conditions were excellent.

Composite of the Evaluation Sheets

STAFF DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION PROGRAM
ABILENE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

TITLE OF WORKSHOP OR SESSION: Emotional Problems in Primary Grades DATE: AUG. 25, 1980

1 5

1	0	0	0	3

Staff Dev. No.

Assignment Level (Check One)

(6)
0 _____ Preschool - K
1 _____ 1 - 3
2 _____ 4 - 6
3 _____ Combination K-6
4 _____ Combination Elem. & Junior High
5 _____ Middle School/Junior High
6 _____ High School
7 _____ Combination Jr. & Sr. High
8 _____ All Levels
9 _____ Other

Position (Check One)

(7-8)
01 _____ Teacher
02 _____ Principal
03 _____ Asst. (Assoc.) Principal
04 _____ Consultant/Supervisor
05 _____ Diagnostician/Psychologist
06 _____ Aide
07 _____ Superintendent
08 _____ Counselor
09 _____ Media Specialist
10 _____ Librarian
11 _____ Nurse
12 _____ Physician
13 _____ Visiting Teacher
14 _____ Central Office Administrator
15 _____ Other (Specify) _____

DIRECTION: Please circle the number which best represents your reaction to each of the items below:

1. The organization of the workshop was — Excellent 7 (6) 5 4 3 2 1 Poor
2. The objectives of the workshop as outlined in the catalogue were — Clearly Evident 7 (6) 5 4 3 2 1 Vague
3. The work of the presenter(s) was: — Excellent 7 (6) 5 4 3 2 1 Poor
4. The ideas and activities presented were: — Very Interesting (7) 6 5 4 3 2 1 Dull
5. The scope (coverage) of objectives was: — Achieved (7) 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not Achieved
6. Information gained at this workshop should prove: — Very Beneficial 7 6 (5) 4 3 2 1 No Benefit
7. Overall, I consider this workshop: — Excellent 7 (6) 5 4 3 2 1 Poor
8. The ideas and activities presented were: — Useful 7 (6) 5 4 3 2 1 Useless

61

Av. = 6.125

STAFF DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION FORM
EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER/REGION 14

STAFF DEVELOPMENT TITLE: Behavior Mangement - ECH DATE: [1–6]

[7] SEQUENCE NO. [11–12] PROG/SERV. AREA 49 [13–14] CONSULTANT 47

DIRECTIONS: You are asked to rate the work of the consultant(s) workshop on the following items. Please be as frank and honest as you can. Circle the number which best represents your reaction to each question.

(15) 1. The organization of the workshop was:
Excellent 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Poor
70% 24% 6%

(16) 2. The work of the consultant(s) was:
Excellent 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Poor
67% 24% 9%

(17) 3. The ideas and activities presented were:
Very effective 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Ineffectiv
67% 24% 6% 3%

(18) 4. My attendance at this workshop should prove:
Very Beneficial 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 No Benefit
67% 24% 9%

(19) 5. Do you feel a need for additional information about the topic?
1. Yes 48% 2. No 52%

(Additional Comments)

[77–80] A500

STAFF DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION REPORT
EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER - REGION 14

DEV0807

08/04/01

08/01/ TO 12/21/

STAFF DEVELOPMENT NUMBER: 1171-69-67

SERVICE/PROGRAM AREA: 49 TITLE VI-B EARLY CHILDHOOD

TITLE: PARENT INVOLVEMENT

CONSULTANTS: 1 47 IAN RYDHOLM

PRESENTER: DR JOYCE EVANS

2

LOCATION: EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER

3

NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS: 22

DATE: 01/13/01

GOAL/OBJECTIVE: 0210 PROD ACT THT DULP PSNL AWR/CMP INNOV PRG PROD TECH PRE ACDMC DVL SKLS

ITEM SUMMARIES

1. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE WORKSHOP WAS:

	EXCELLENT 7	6	5	4	3	2	POOR 1	NO EVAL	MEAN
	14	4	4						6.45
%	63	18	18						

2. THE WORK OF THE CONSULTANT(S) WAS:

	EXCELLENT 7	6	5	4	3	2	POOR 1	NO EVAL	MEAN
	17	5							6.77
%	77	22							

3. THE IDEAS AND ACTIVITIES PRESENTED WERE:

	VERY EFFECTIVE 7	6	5	4	3	2	INEFFECTIVE 1	NO EVAL	MEAN
	15	6	1						6.63
%	68	27	04						

4. MY ATTENDANCE AT THIS WORKSHOP SHOULD PROVI:

	VERY BENEFICIAL 7	6	5	4	3	2	NO BENEFIT 1	NO EVAL	MEAN
	13	6	2	1					6.40
%	59	27	09	04					

5. NEED FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE TOPIC?

	YES 2	NO 1	NO EVAL	MEAN
	14	8		1.63
%	63	36		

63

64

SITE REPORT SUMMARY

SITE: Child Incorporated

SEDL STAFF: D. Bricker, M. Grace, C. DeLuna

SITE DESCRIPTION:

The sessions were conducted in the conference room of SEDL in downtown Austin and the training room of Child,Inc. in near North Austin. Austin is a metropolitan area of 341,500 located in Central Texas. Participants were drawn from the Austin Head Start program which serves the rural and urban area of Travis County. Participants range in educational background from High School degreed to College degreed. Experience also varies greatly from 15 years to only a few months.

Training Sessions	Date	Type of Facility	Number of Participants			Number of Children		Session Effectiveness (Average)
			Teacher	Aide	*Other	# of C in Ref.	# of HC Served	
Communicating With Children	10-80	HS			P 2			Not Returned
Behavior Problems	11-80	HS	34	31	CD 9		11	4.66
Talking To Learn	11-80	HS	34	31	CD 9		11	4.27
Working With Parents	11-80	HS	34	31	CD 9		11	4.19
Communicating With Children	11-80	HS	34	31	CD 9		11	4.04
Child Development	1-81	HS	41	22	CD 6 NR 1	129	52	4.28
Introducing Materials	2-11	HS	12	8	CD 1			4.58

Participant Comments:

11-80 "I enjoyed making different kinds of materials for each classroom."

11-80 "I found building cooperation with parents to be helpful to me, because this is what we need most in our center."

11-80 "The entire workshop helped me to decide what the problem is that I am having with a poor vision child, now I know what has to be done. Thank you."

11-80 "I found everything helpful, especially how I can communicate with children better."

1-81 "The session was helpful because I learned more of how to arrange and to work with my class."

Trainer Comments:

The first session was conducted for parents at Child Inc. due to an attendance of 4, many of the activities were less effective. The remainder of the sessions for the staff were well attended. The staff was much more enthusiastic than in the past. They volunteered to participate in activities which had not been the case in previous years.

Date: November 6, 1980 Site: Child Inc. at SEDL

Trainer: Connie DeLuna Session: Communicating With Children

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 57. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	44%	30%	23%		3%	Boring	4.10
Well Organized	51%	28%	17%	2%	2%	Confusing	4.24
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	46%	28%	20%	4%	2%	Not practical	4.14
3. I learned:							
Very much	45%	24.5%	23%	35%	3.5%	Very little	4.05
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	28%	32%	26%	9%	5%	Very little	3.68

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable	Too Complex	Average	Too Simple	Mean Rating
90%	4%		6%	4.04

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 94% No 6%

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 90% No 10%

Date: November 6, 1980 Site: Child Inc.

Trainer: M. Grace Session: Working With Parents

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 37. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	54%	35%	8%	3%		Boring	4.40
Well Organized	71%	20%	6%	3%		Confusing	4.6
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	53%	30%	17%			Not practical	4.36
3. I learned:							
Very much	49%	35%	13%	3%		Very little	4.29
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	20%	23%	34%	11%	11%	Very little	3.29
						Average	4.19

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable 94% Too Complex Too Simple 6%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 90% No 3%

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 96% No 4%

Date: November 7, 1980 Site: Child Inc. at SEDL

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Talking to Learn

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 63. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	53%	40%	5%	2%		Boring	4.45
Well Organized	61%	35%	2%	2%		Confusing	4.56
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	61%	34%	5%			Not practical	4.56
3. I learned:							
Very much	39%	53%	8%			Very little	4.31
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	23%	39%	12%	10%	16%	Very little	3.45
						Average	4.27

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable	Too Complex	Too Simple
98%	2%	

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 96% No 4%

Date: November 7, 1980 Site: Child Inc. at SEDL

Trainer: C. DeLuna Session: Behavioral Problems

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 60. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	80%	13%	7%			Boring	4.73
Well Organized	86%	10.5%	3.5%			Confusing	4.82
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	82%	13%	5%			Not practical	4.76
3. I learned:							
Very much	73.3%	18.3%	83.8%			Very little	4.65
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	66%	14%	13%	2%	5%	Very little	4.34

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.66

Understandable 98% Too Complex Too Simple 2%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 98% No 2%

Date: January 16, 1981 Site: Child Inc. at SEDL

Trainer: Donna Bricker Session: Child Development

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 64. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	58%	32%	7%		3%	Boring	4.4
Well Organized	59%	53%	7%		1%	Confusing	4.5
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	58%	30%	9%	1.5%	1.5%	Not practical	4.4
3. I learned:							
Very much	44%	48%	.5%	1.5%	1.5%	Very little	4.3
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	26%	36%	30%	6.5%	1.5%	Very little	3.8

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.28

Understandable	Too Complex	Too Simple
95%	2%	3%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 63 No 1

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 60 No 2

Date: February 11, 1981 Site: Child Inc.

Trainer: Donna Bricker-Derkacz Session: Introducing Materials

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 21. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	80%	20%				Boring	4.8
Well Organized	78%	22%				Confusing	4.8
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	77%	15%	8%			Not practical	4.7
3. I learned:							
Very much	54%	39%	7%			Very little	4.5
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	39%	30.5%	30.5%			Very little	4.1
						Average	4.58

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 92% No 8%

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 92% No 8%

SITE REPORT SUMMARY

SITE: Community Council of So. Central Texas

SEDL STAFF: Bricker, DeLuna, Grace

SITE DESCRIPTION:

Located in Central Texas, Seguin is a small town (18,000 population) approximately 28 miles from San Antonio, a major metropolitan area. Training participants come from Head Start Centers located in New Braunfels and Seguin. This year participants from local day care centers and public school were also included. Participants serve a tri-ethnic population and themselves represent their ethnic groups of black, Mexican American and Anglo.

Training Sessions	Date	Type of Facility	Number of Participants			Number of Children		Session Effectiveness (Average)
			Teacher	Aide	*Other	# of C in Ref.	# of HC Served	
Technical Assistance	6/80	Head Start			HSC 1	-	28	NA
Teaching the Bilingual Child	8/80	Head Start	6	8	HSC 1 PD 1 NR 2		28	4.45
Handling Behavior Problems	9/80	Head St 18 Pub Sch 1 Day 4	10	8	SED 1 PC 1 HSC 1 NR 2	7 25 3	28 18	4.39
Music for the Main-Stream Classroom	12/80	Head St 19 Public S 3 Day Care 9	9	16	SED 1 HSC 1 PD 1 NR 3	9 355 10	32 348 1	4.27
Communicating with Children	12/80	"	9	16				Combined Evaluation

Participant Comments:

8-80 "I liked the handout she gave to us."

9-80 "The part when various problems was discussed and everyone took part in the discussion."

12-80 "I found both parts communication/music very helpful - especially the music. We need more of a variety in music and action songs."

Trainer Comments:

Technical Assistance was delivered in June 1980 in order to provide Alice Schulze with information regarding alternative training modes. During that time plans were made for future training. One session was conducted on bilingual children and a second addressed behavior issues.

Date: 8/12/80 Site: Community Council of So. Central Texas

Trainer: C. DeLuna Session: Bilingual Language Training

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 18. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	73%	20%	7%			Boring	4.67
Well Organized	80%	13%	7%			Confusing	4.73
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	67%	27%	7%			Not practical	4.60
3. I learned:							
Very much	47%	47%	7%			Very little	4.40
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	13%	60%	20%	7%		Very little	3.87
						Average	4.45

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable — Too Complex — Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

Date: 9/80

Site: Community Council of So. Central Texas

Trainer: Donna Bricker

Session: Handling Behavior Problems

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 22. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	68%	27%	5%			Boring	4.64
Well Organized	65%	25%	10%			Confusing	4.55
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	62%	29%	10%			Not practical	4.52
3. I learned:							
Very much	48%	43%	10%			Very little	4.38
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	27%	41%	23%	9%		Very little	3.86
						Average	4.39

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable — Too Complex — Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

Date: 12/80 Site: Community Council of So. Central Texas

Trainer: Donna Bricker/Mary Grace Session: Communicating/Music

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 31. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	63%	33%	3%			Boring	4.60
Well Organized	71%	23%	3%	3%		Confusing	4.61
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	70%	30%	3%			Not practical	4.63
3. I learned:							
Very much	48%	39%	13%			Very little	4.35
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	21%	28%	17%	14%	21%	Very little	3.14

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.27

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

SITE REPORT SUMMARY

SITE: Hays, Caldwell, Blanco Head Start

SEDL STAFF: Mary Grace

SITE DESCRIPTION:

Training was conducted in San Marcos, a small Central Texas city, with participants drawn from the rural areas of Kyle, Blanco and Lockhart. The ethnic composition of the participants was 21% Anglo, 67% Mexican American and 12% Black. A tri-ethnic population of children was served by the participants. Twenty participants attended more than one training workshop.

Training Sessions	Date	Type of Facility	Number of Participants			Number of Children		Session Effectiveness (Average)
			Teacher	Aide	*Other	# of C in Ref.	# of HC Served	
Teaching Children with Language Problems	8/80	Head Start	5	8	CD 3 HSC 1		22	4.85
Teaching the Hard to Teach Child	8/80	Head Start	5	8	CD 3 HSC 1		22	4.85
On-site training and Technical Assistance	9/80	Head Start	2	3	-	-	-	-
On-site training and Technical Assistance	10/80	Head Start	2	4	-	-	-	-
Working with Parents of the Handicapped	1/81	Head Start	5	5	CD 4 HSC 1 PC 1	31	33	4.58
Parents are our Best Resources	1/81	Head Start	5	5	V 1 "	31	33	4.58
Building Self Esteem in Handicapped Children	3/81	Head Start	5	11	CD 4 HSC 1 PC 1	-	31	4.55
Creative Arts in the Mainstream Classroom	3/81	Head Start	5	11	V 1 MHC 1	-	31	4.69

Participant Comments:

8-80 "I will use the sensory approach and use boundaries for limits."

1-81 "Handouts were helpful. Very good communication." "Trainer permitted just enough feedback from teacher. Used role play just enough."

3-81 "I will use the thinking chair and be more selective as to subjects and length of time when I conduct a 'Magic Circle'." I will use the ideas on Magic Circle to use simple topics that are the children's level." "I will make the stick puppets and use in my magic circle. Also use the puppets for our topics to make it interesting for the children." "Very good presentation. I will use the printing and make the play dough. I will try to use all I've learned here today."

Trainer Comments:

8-80 Arrangements for the training location, refreshments and agenda were handled by the site. Participants were most helpful in setting up and cleaning up the training room. Several participants commented that of the four days of inservice they were receiving, the SEDL day was the only one they were excited about because they felt that they would be receiving practical suggestions and information that they could use in the classroom.

1-81 As this site has a parent involvement program, some of the ideas and information presented were already being used by the centers. A prior conversation with the parent involvement coordinator instead of the handicapped services coordinator would have been helpful.

3-81 Participants expressed their appreciation for the past two years of training with applause at the end of the day. Several participants asked if there was anyone they could write to request continuation of the training.

Date: 8/80 Site: Hays, Caldwell, Blanco Head Start

Trainer: M. Grace Session: Working with Parents

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 16. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	100%					Boring	5.00
Well Organized	94%	6%				Confusing	4.94
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	75%	25%				Not practical	4.75
3. I learned:							
Very much	.875%	.125%				Very little	4.87
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	81%	6%	13%			Very little	4.69

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.85

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

Date: 1/81 Site: Hays, Caldwell, Blanco Head Start

Trainer: M. Grace Session: Working with Parents

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 14. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	79%	14%	7%			Boring	4.71
Well Organized	86%	14%				Confusing	4.86
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	71%	29%				Not practical	4.71
3. I learned:							
Very much	54%	38%	8%			Very little	4.46
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	36%	43%	21%			Very little	4.14
5. Overall this session was:						Average	4.58
Understandable 100%			Too Complex			Too Simple	

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

Date: 3/81 Site: Hays, Caldwell, Blanco Head Start

Trainer: M. Grace Session: Building Self Esteem in Handicapped Children

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 20. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	74%	21%	5%			Boring	4.68
Well Organized	72%	28%				Confusing	4.72
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	68%	32%				Not practical	4.68
3. I learned:							
Very much	58%	37%	5%			Very little	4.53
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	50%	25%	19%			Very little	4.12
5. Overall this session was:						Average	4.55
Understandable		Too Complex				Too Simple	
95%		5%					

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 94% No 6%

Date: 3/81 Site: Hays, Caldwell, Blanco Head Start

Trainer: M. Grace Session: Creative Activities

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 20. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	85%	10%	5%			Boring	4.80
Well Organized	89%	11%				Confusing	4.89
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	80%	20%				Not practical	4.80
3. I learned:							
Very much	74%	26%				Very little	4.74
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	53%	26%	11%	5%	5%	Very little	4.16
						Average	4.68

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 94% No 6%

SITE REPORT SUMMARY

SITE: Odessa College

SEDL STAFF: Bricker, Evans, Grace

SITE DESCRIPTION:

Odessa (population 90,000) is located in West Texas. Participants come from surrounding towns of Pecos, Crane, Andrews, Monahans, Lames, and Midland. All training is conducted on the campus of the Odessa College and participants are notified of training by the Odessa College Staff. They represent a varied background in educational level, experience and job responsibility. Participants serve a tri-ethnic population in various public and private programs throughout the area.

Training Sessions	Date	Type of Facility	Number of Participants			Number of Children		Session Effectiveness (Average)
			Teacher	Aide	*Other	# of C in Ref.	# of HC Served	
Communicating With Children	9/80	DC 6 HS 3 PS 2	36	18	NR 10 S 1 C 4	NR	28	4.26
Handling Behavior Problems	9/80	PrS 9 JC 3	36	18	CD 8 PD 2 SW 1	NR	28	4.49
Bilingual-Bicultural Children	9/80	NR 9	36	18	C 1	NR	28	4.56
Teaching Toddlers	2/81	PrDC 10 PbDC 8	12	5	CD 1	NR	13	4.11
Teaching Children With Emotional Problems	2/81	PrDC 10 PbDC 8	12	5	CD 1	NR	13	4.77
Teaching the Hard to Teach Child	4/81	PrDC 22 PbDC 10 HS 1	21	9	CD 4 CSW 1 S 1	NR	8	4.56
Handling Behavior Problems	4/81	NR 4	21	9	Coor 1 NR 1	NR	8	4.52
Creating a Captivating Classroom	4/81	NR 4	21	9	Coor 1 NR 1	NR	8	4.26

Participant Comments:

2-81 "I will use some of the ideas on speaking with parents when I fell their child has a problem."

4-81 "I have gotten some ideas and knowledge I didn't have before - I will try some. Very well prepared." "Enjoyed a lot of it especially the practical applications instructor used on behavior problems and opinions." "The examples part where you showed us things to do. Didn't allow enough time for this but I will remember more by seeing what you talked about." "I am going to use the organization plan on how to use space."

Trainer Comments:

Marilyn Hare, Child Development Instructor served as contact person for the year. She send out announcements, handled pre-registration, room arrangements and arranged for refreshments, audiovisual equipment and registration on the evening of the training. Two college staff persons attended all training workshops. One instructor attended two of the workshops. Registration and training space were better planned this year. The college instructors indicated that they were utilizing the information and handouts in their courses to create an awareness of how to work with handicapped children in day care centers.

Date: 9/80 Site: Odessa College

Trainer: Donna Bricker Session: Handling Behavior Problems

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 48. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	89%	9%	2%			Boring	4.87
Well Organized	84%	16%				Confusing	4.84
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	84%	16%				Not practical	4.84
3. I learned:							
Very much	74%	24%	2%			Very little	4.72
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	26%	39%	18%	15%	38%	Very little	3.18
						Average	4.49

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable — Too Complex — Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____

Date: 9/80 Site: Odessa College

Trainer: Connie DeLuna Session: Bi-lingual Bi-cultural

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 11. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	73%	27%				Boring	4.73
Well Organized	70%	30%				Confusing	4.70
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	64%	36%				Not practical	4.64
3. I learned:							
Very much	73%	27%				Very little	4.73
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	45%	27%	18%		9%	Very little	4.00
5. Overall this session was:						Average	4.56
Understandable			Too Complex			Too Simple	
	100%						

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____

Date: 9/80 Site: Odessa College

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Communicating with Children

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 51. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	78%	18%	4%			Boring	4.73
Well Organized	79%	17%	5%			Confusing	4.74
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	76%	22%	2%			Not practical	4.74
3. I learned:							
Very much	59%	24%	18%			Very little	4.41
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	25%	8%	13%	20%	35%	Very little	2.68
5. Overall this session was:						Average	4.26

Understandable 98% Too Complex Too Simple 2%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 96% No 4%

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 90% No 10%

Date: 2/81 Site: Odessa College

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Teaching Children with Emotional Problems

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 21. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	86%	14%				Boring	4.86
Well Organized	95%	5%				Confusing	4.95
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	86%	10%	5%			Not practical	4.81
3. I learned:							
Very much	76%	10%	14%			Very little	4.62
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	76%	10%	14%			Very little	4.62

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.77

Understandable 100% Too Complex Too Simple

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 95% No 5%

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No

Date: 2/81 Site: Odessa College

Trainer: Evans Session: Teaching Toddlers

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 20. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	74%	11%	5%	11%		Boring	4.47
Well Organized	84%	6%	6%	6%		Confusing	4.66
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	68%	16%	11%	5%		Not practical	4.47
3. I learned:							
Very much	55%	20%	20%	5%		Very little	4.25
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	31%		15%	15%	39%	Very little	2.69
						Average	4.11

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable 100% Too Complex Too Simple

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 89% No 11%

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 89% No 11%

Date: 4/81 Site: Odessa College

Trainer: Donna Bricker Session: Handling Behavior Problems

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 35. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	84%	16%				Boring	4.8
Well Organized	86%	7%	4%	4%		Confusing	4.8
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	91%	9%				Not practical	4.9
3. I learned:							
Very much	74%	21%	5%			Very little	4.7
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	27%	17%	30%	20%		Very little	3.4
						Average	4.52

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable 97% Too Complex Too Simple 1%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____

Date: 4/81 Site: Odessa College

Trainer: J. Evans Session: Captivating Classroom

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 34. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	71%	16%	16%			Boring	4.68
Well Organized	77%	23%	3%			Confusing	4.87
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	66%	25%	13%			Not practical	4.66
3. I learned:							
Very much	59%	31%	13%			Very little	4.59
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	25%	5%	10%	10%	55%	Very little	2.50
						Average	4.26

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____

Date: 4/81 Site: Odessa College

Trainer: M. Grace Session: Teaching the Hard-to-Teach Child

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 34. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	68%	29%	3%			Boring	4.65
Well Organized	91%	7%	3%			Confusing	4.87
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	73%	27%				Not practical	4.72
3. I learned:							
Very much	67%	24%	6%	3%		Very little	4.55
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	52%	19%	10%	16%	3%	Very little	4.00

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.56

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

97% 3%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____

SITE REPORT SUMMARY

SITE: SEDL Invitational

SEDL STAFF DeLuna, Grace, Bricker

SITE DESCRIPTION:

Training was conducted in the conference rooms at SEDL in Austin, a metropolitan area (pop. 270,000) in Central Texas. Refreshments and audio visual equipment were provided by the Special Projects Division of SEDL. Displays of resource books and materials for use in Early Childhood were arranged for viewing. Materials catalogs were also made available to interested participants.

Training Sessions	Date	Type of Facility	Number of Participants			Number of Children		Session Effectiveness (Average)
			Teacher	Aide	*Other	# of C in Ref.	# of HC Served	
Listening To Learn	10-80	HS 2 PrDC 19 PbDC 14	41	3	CD 10 EC 2 SEC 1	6	15	4.29
Introducing Materials	10-80	PS 2 PrS 17 Other 4	41	3	CD 10 EC 2 SEC 1	6	15	4.32
Language Problems	10-80	"	41	3	CD 10 EC 2 SEC 1	6	15	4.69
Identifying Children In Need of Referral	10-80	"	41	3	CD 10 EC 2 SEC 1	6	15	4.48
Planning the Toddler Room	10-80	"	41	3	CD 10 EC 2 SEC 1	6	15	4.38
Learning Through the Senses	10-80	"	41	3	CD 10 EC 2 SEC 1	6	15	4.47

Participant Comments:

"I learned how I must first know the child, know the material, and then connect them."

"I became more aware of developing listening skills and I will use all activities that I get prepared to use."

"The trainer gave theoretical information plus practical use. That is very important."

Trainer Comments:

Announcements of the workshop were sent to all licensed day care facilities within a 100 mile radius of Austin. This included child care workers and early childhood educators throughout the state who requested to be put on a mailing list. Two public school staff persons from Louisiana also attended. The experience level and educational backgrounds of participants varied greatly. Educationally the range was from Master's level with some special education coursework to GED certificate with no prior training in early childhood education. Experientially participants varied from having less than one year of experience to more than ten years. Participants consistently offered positive comments on the session evaluations about practicality and immediate applicability of information and activities presented during the workshop.

Date: 10/14/80 Site: SEDL Invitational

Trainer: D. Bricker Session: Planning the Toddler Room

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 20. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	84%	5%	5%		5%	Boring	4.63
Well Organized	88%	6%	6%			Confusing	4.82
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	80%	5%	10%	5%		Not practical	4.6
3. I learned:							
Very much	70%	20%	5%	5%		Very little	4.6
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	$53\frac{1}{3}\%$			$13\frac{1}{3}\%$	$33\frac{1}{3}\%$	Very little	3.26

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.38

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____

Date: 10/14/80 Site: SEDL Invitational

Trainer: D. Bricker Session: Learning Through the Senses

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 35. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	85%	12%	3%			Boring	4.81
Well Organized	88%	9%	3%			Confusing	4.85
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	73%	15%	3%	6%	3%	Not practical	4.5
3. I learned:							
Very much	73%	15%	6%	3%	3%	Very little	4.51
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	27%	37%	20%	13%	3%	Very little	3.7
						Average	4.47

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____

Date: 10/14/80 Site: SEDL Invitational

Trainer: C. DeLuna Session: Introducing Materials

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 33. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	79%	21%				Boring	4.78
Well Organized	84%	16%				Confusing	4.83
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	82%	15%	3%			Not practical	4.78
3. I learned:							
Very much	45%	52%	3%			Very little	4.42
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	27%	15%	8%	12%	38%	Very little	2.8

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.32

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

Date: 10/14/80 Site: SEDL Invitational

Trainer: C. DeLuna Session: Identifying Children In Need of Referral

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was _____. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	63%	38%				Boring	4.63
Well Organized	71%	29%				Confusing	4.71
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	88%	12%				Not practical	4.88
3. I learned:							
Very much	63%	38%				Very little	4.63
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	57%	29%	14%			Very little	3.57
5. Overall this session was:						Average	4.48
Understandable			Too Complex			Too Simple	
100%							

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 86% No 14% _____

Date: 10/14/80 Site: SEDL Invitational

Trainer: M. Grace Session: Listening To Learn

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 33. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	67%	33%				Boring	4.67
Well Organized	90%	10%				Confusing	4.90
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	71%	19%	37%		6%	Not practical	4.48
3. I learned:							
Very much	44%	44%	6%	6%		Very little	4.25
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	23%	10%	33%	27%	7%	Very little	3.17

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.29

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

Date: 10/14/80 Site: SEDL Invitational

Trainer: M. Grace Session: Language Problems

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 13. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	77%	23%				Boring	4.77
Well Organized	100%					Confusing	5.0
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	92%	8%				Not practical	4.91
3. I learned:							
Very much	77%	15%	8%			Very little	4.69
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	55%	18%	18%		9%	Very little	4.09

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.69

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

SITE REPORT SUMMARY

SITE: Temple 4-C

SEDL STAFF: Mary Grace

SITE DESCRIPTION:

Participants were drawn from Temple (pop. 48,500) and surrounding small towns in the central Texas area. They represent public day care and after school providers. Educational and experiential backgrounds of the participants varied greatly. Participants were predominantly high school educated with 2 or 3 years experience working with young children. Attendance has been sporadic with limited coordination and staff turn-over of the contact persons at the 4-C office. Children range in age from 3 to 5 years and are from a tri-ethnic low-income population.

Training Sessions	Date	Type of Facility	Number of Participants			Number of Children		Session Effectiveness (Average)
			Teacher	Aide	*Other	# of C in Ref.	# of HC Served	
Communicating	9-80	HS		2	CD 1 AD 1 HSD 1 ASCD 1	10	1	4.48
Playgrounds and Outdoor Activities	1-81	HS	2	9	CD 3	NR	28	4.71
Working With Parents	1-81	HS	2	10		NR	30	4.75

Participant Comments:

1-81 "I really enjoyed the activity session - always looking for new ideas to introduce to my children."

1-81 "I liked the participating in games. I myself learn best by participating.

Trainer Comments:

9-80 Attendance was poor. The only suspected reason was lack of release time for Title XX staff and private staff. The 4-C was undergoing an executive director change which could have accounted for lack of coordination and follow thru on publicity and room arrangement. Refreshments were provided by 4-C.

1-81 Attendance improved greatly although no coordination among various agencies and programs was in evidence. The Head Start staff were still the only attendees. The program took responsibility for welcoming participants and providing refreshments.

Date: September 17, 1980 Site: Temple 4-C

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Communicating

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 8. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting						Boring	5
Well Organized						Confusing	5
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	85%	16%				Not practical	4.83
3. I learned:							
Very much	83%	16%				Very little	4.83
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	25%	25%			50%	Very little	2.75
						Average	4.48

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable 100% Too Complex Too Simple

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes_____ No_____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes_____ No_____ _____

Date: January 16, 1981 Site: Temple 4-C

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Working With Parents

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 6. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	5	4	Rating 3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	80%	20%				Boring	4.8
Well Organized	80%	20%				Confusing	4.8
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	83%	17%				Not practical	4.83
3. I learned:							
Very much	67%	33%				Very little	4.67
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	67%	33%				Very little	4.67

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.75

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

Date: January 16, 1981 Site: Temple 4-C

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Playgrounds & Outdoor Activities

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was _____. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	78%	11%	11%			Boring	4.66
Well Organized	80%	20%				Confusing	4.8
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	9%	9%				Not practical	4.91
3. I learned:							
Very much	82%	18%				Very little	4.82
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	50%	40%	10%			Very little	4.4

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.71

Understandable 100% Too Complex Too Simple

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

SITE REPORT SUMMARY

SITE: TMC - Valley

SEDL STAFF: M. Grace, C. DeLuna, D. Bricker

SITE DESCRIPTION:

Training was conducted in Edcouch and Mercedes Texas, South Texas towns with populations of under 30,000. Participants were drawn from centers located in smaller rural towns between McAllen, Harlingen and Brownsville. 99% of the children served in this program are of Mexican American origin and come from families who are migrant farm workers.

Training Sessions	Date	Type of Facility	Number of Participants			Number of Children		Session Effectiveness (Average)
			Teacher	Aide	*Other	# of C in Ref.	# of HC Served	
Building a Teaching Team - Communicating	10-80	HS	37	20	HS 2 C 2 HT 1		15	4.18
Building a Teaching Team - Organization	10-80	HS	37	20	HS 2 C 2 HT 1		15	4.34
Child Development	10-80	HS	37	20	HS 2 C 2 HT 1		15	4.44
Introducing Materials	10-80	HS	37	20	HS 2 C 2 HT 1		15	4.64
Creating the Captivating Classroom	1-81	HS	48	25	EC 1 C 1		41	4.62
Identifying Children In Need of Referral	1-81	HS	48	25	EC 1 C 1		41	4.29
Using Materials With Handicapped Children	1-81	HS	48	25	EC 1 C 1		41	4.58
Language Development Through Storytelling	1-81	HS	48	25	EC 1 C 1		41	4.64
Naptime Procedure	3-81	HS	23	23	EC 1		NR	4.44
Case Study	3-81	HS	23	23	EC 1		NR	4.42

Participant Comments:

10-80 "The session helped us teachers learn the importance that we have to plan with the assistant teacher, that we both need to get together and plan on what each have to do."

10-80 "I learned about how to first give the children all the imput then later ask the questions. This is something I can implement with my own children."

1-81 "I learned how to go find a book at the language level of a child and with pictures that relate to the child."

3-81 "All of the naptime procedures are very essential for these children. It really helps a teacher to have a better room for children."

3-81 "All parts of the workshop are helpful because you never know what handicap a child might have and in these workshops you learn how to work with different handicaps."

Trainer Comments:

10-80 Training was coordinated through the area supervisor, however, very
1-81 limited assistance with room arrangements and hostessing was provided.

3-81 Participants were divided into groups lead by a head teacher. Training was conducted by the head teachers under supervision of the SEDL staff. Feedback was provided upon completion. This arrangement was scheduled to help prepare head teachers who will be training their own staff next year. Much more responsibility for hostessing and room arrangement was also taken by the staff during this session.

Date: October 28, 29, 1980 Site: Valley

Trainer: Connie DeLuna Session: Introducing Materials

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 25. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	68%	24%	8%			Boring	4.6
Well Organized	73%	18%	9%			Confusing	4.6
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	75%	25%				Not practical	4.8
3. I learned:							
Very much	68%	32%				Very little	4.7
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	68%	20%	8%	4%		Very little	4.5
5. Overall this session was:						Average	4.64
Understandable		Too Complex				Too Simple	
100%							

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100 No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100 No _____ _____

Date: October 28 - 29 Site: Valley

Trainer: Connie DeLuna Session: Child Development

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 61. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	65.5%	29.5%	5%			Boring	4.6
Well Organized	67.5%	27.5%	5%			Confusing	4.6
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	59%	39%	2%			Not practical	4.5
3. I learned:							
Very much	52%	42%	6%			Very little	4.5
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	46%	22.5%	3.5%	3.5%	5.5%	Very little	4.0

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.44

Understandable	Too Complex	Too Simple
98%		2%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 98% No 2%

Date: October 28, 29, 1980 Site: Valley

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Teaching Team

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 63. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	64%	34%	2%			Boring	4.3
Well Organized	73%	25%	2%			Confusing	4.7
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	66%	33%	1%			Not practical	4.6
3. I learned:							
Very much	51%	42%	7%			Very little	4.4
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	19%	23%	21%	10%	27%	Very little	2.9

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.18

Understandable	Too Complex	Too Simple
98%		2%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 98% No 2%

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No

Date: October 28, 29, 1980 Site: Valley

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Teaching Team: Organizing

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 47. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	64%	26%	8%	2%		Boring	4.6
Well Organized	69%	26%	5%			Confusing	4.6
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	67%	26%	7%			Not practical	4.6
3. I learned:							
Very much	57%	32%	11%			Very little	4.5
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	37%	21%	17%	6%	17%	Very little	3.4

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.34

Understandable	Too Complex	Too Simple
97%		3%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____

Date: January 1, 1981 Site: TMC Valley

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Identifying Children In Need of Referral

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 57. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	54%	36%	7%		3%	Boring	4.36
Well Organized	63%	27%	8%	2%		Confusing	4.5
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	60%	30%	10%			Not practical	4.5
3. I learned:							
Very much	52%	32%	11%	20%	2%	Very little	4.3
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	38%	32%	11%	5%	5%	Very little	3.8

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.29

Understandable	Too Complex	Too Simple
94%	2%	4%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 96% No 4%

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 94% No 6%

Date: January 1, 1981 Site: Valley-TMC

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Using Materials With Handicapped Children

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 64. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	70%	23%	3%	2%	2%	Boring	4.59
Well Organized	71%	27%	2%			Confusing	4.69
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	70%	24%	3%		3%	Not practical	4.56
3. I learned:							
Very much	66%	54%	6%		1.5%	Very little	4.55
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	63%	27%	8%	2%		Very little	4.52

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.58

Understandable	Too Complex	Too Simple
98%	2%	

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 96% No 4%

Date: January 8, 1981 Site: Valley - TMC - Mercedes - Municipal Bldg

Trainer: _____ Session: Creating the Captivating Classroom

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 68. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	49%	11%	1%			Boring	4.8
Well Organized	40%	13%				Confusing	4.8
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	49%	15%				Not practical	4.8
3. I learned:							
Very much	45%	17%	2%	1%		Very little	4.6
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	28%	18%	11%	2%	3%	Very little	4.1

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.62

Understandable 64% Too Complex Too Simple

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 64% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 64% No _____ _____

Date: January 9, 1981 Site: Valley TMC (Mercedes, TX)

Trainer: Donna Bricker Session: Language Development Through Storystelling

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 62. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	73%	25%	2%			Boring	4.7
Well Organized	74%	24%	2%			Confusing	4.7
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	69%	28%	3%			Not practical	4.7
3. I learned:							
Very much	66%	34%				Very little	4.7
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	58%	30%	7%	4%	1%	Very little	4.4

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.64

Understandable 57% Too Complex Too Simple

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 60 No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 57 No _____ _____

Date: March 19, 1981 Site: Valley

Trainer: Donna Bricker, Mary Grace Session: Naptime Procedure

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 21. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	72%	18%				Boring	4.7
Well Organized	79%	16%	5%			Confusing	4.3
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	71%	24%	5%			Not practical	4.7
3. I learned:							
Very much	52%	38%	5%	5%		Very little	4.4
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	43%	33%	14%	10%		Very little	4.1

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.44

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 94% No 6%

Date: March 19, 1981 Site: Valley

Trainer: Donna Bricker, Mary Grace Session: Case Study

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was _____. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	50%	45%	5%			Boring	4.5
Well Organized	55%	32%	13%			Confusing	4.4
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	61%	35%	4%			Not practical	4.6
3. I learned:							
Very much	50%	36%	14%			Very little	4.4
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	48%	26%	26%			Very little	4.2

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.42

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

SITE REPORT SUMMARY

SITE: TMC - Wintergarden

SEDL STAFF: DeLuna, Grace, Bricker

SITE DESCRIPTION:

Training was conducted at the Crystal City and Eagle Pass centers located in South Texas. Participants were drawn from Eagle Pass, (Pop. 15,364) and surrounding communities. This area is bordered by the cities of Laredo, Del Rio and Uvalde, Texas. Some participants at this site are Spanish dominant with limited English, 90% have a high school education or less.

Training Sessions	Date	Type of Facility	Number of Participants			Number of Children		Session Effectiveness (Average)
			Teacher	Aide	*Other	# of C in Ref.	# of HC Served	
Introducing Materials	10-80	HS	20	17	HA 2 N 1 NR 2			4.38
Teaching Team: Communication	10-80	HS	20	17	HA 2 N 1 HA 2			4.07
Organization Captivating Classroom	1-81	HS	13	17	CD 6 HA 2 SEC 1	28	23	4.74
Language Development Through Storytelling	1-81	HS	13	17	P 1 NR 7 HS 2	28	23	4.60
Identifying Children in Need of Referral	1-81	HS	13	17	P 1 NR 7 HS 2	28	23	4.70
Using Materials with Handicapped Children	1-81	HS	13	17	P 1 NR 7 HS 2	28	23	4.[illegible]
Language Development Through Storytelling	1-81	HS	13	17				4.82
Child Development	3-81	HS	1	6				4.62
Case Study	3-81	HS	18	13	CD6/HA2 HT /AS1 EC1			4.44
Naptime Procedure	3-81	HS	18	13	HS 2 HT 7			4.72
Team Teaching: Organizing	3-81	HS	18	13				4.55

Participant Comments:

10-80 "I think the communication workshop will help me get alone with the other teachers."

10-80 "I learned to be prepared and organize,to present my activities, knowing my materials and following a sequential pattern."

10-80 "The charts used for this session are very helpful to us when working with and teaching children."

1-81 "Todo estuvo muy bien explicado."

1-81 "I found observing children at work most helpful."

1-81 "Toda las partes de entreniamento son interesantes y educativas, y facil de entender."

3-81 "I learned that organized and planned activities for the individual child's needs in development are important.

Trainer Comments:

10-80 Participants had arrived from summer work in the northern U.S. within the week. No T.M.C. personnel were put in charge of training. All hostessing and introductions had to be carried out by SEDL staff. The building air conditioning was malfunctioning in one of the training rooms necessitating training outdoors in the afternoon.

1-81 and 3-81 Training was coordinated and hosted by the area supervisor. Conditions were very good. Refreshments were provided by T.M.C. Area Staff was available to assist with room arrangements, packing and unpacking. More responsibility for training arrangements was successfully taken by T.M.C. during these two training workshops.

Date: October 10, 1980 Site: TMC Crystal City

Trainer: Connie DeLuna Session: Introducing Material

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 30. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	77.5%	15%	.5%		2.5%	Boring	4.7
Well Organized	71%	21%	.5%		3%	Confusing	4.6
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	75%	17.5%	.5%		2.5%	Not practical	4.6
3. I learned:							
Very much	50%	37.5%	7.5%	2.5%	2.5%	Very little	4.3
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	37.5%	27.5%	17.5%	2.5%	15%	Very little	3.7

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.38

Understandable	Too Complex	Too Simple
95%	5%	

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 97% No 3%

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 97% No 3%

Date: October 10, 1980 Site: Wintergarten

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Teaching Team: Communication

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 27. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	55%	22%	19%		4%	Boring	4.26
Well Organized	50%	23%	23%		4%	Confusing	4.32
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	46%	38%	12%		4%	Not practical	4.23
3. I learned:							
Very much	50%	27%	19%		4%	Very little	4.19
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	24%	33%	19%	5%	19%	Very little	3.38

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.07

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100 % No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 87% No 13%

Date: January 20, 1981 Site: TMC - Wintergarten

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Observing Children in Need of Referral

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 44. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	33/81%	7/17%	1/2%			Boring	4.78
Well Organized	27/71%	10/26%	1/3%			Confusing	4.68
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	32/74%	11/26%				Not practical	4.74
3. I learned:							
Very much	32/73%	10/23%	2/4%			Very little	4.68
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	31/74%	8/19%	2/5%	1/2%		Very little	4.64

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.70

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

43/100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 40/98% No 1/2%

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 36/97% No 1/3%

Date: January 21, 1981 Site: TMC - Wintergarten

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Using Materials with the Handicapped

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 44. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	29/74%	23/9%	1/3%			Boring	4.71
Well Organized	32/84%	5/13%	1/3%			Confusing	4.81
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	36/86%	6/14%				Not practical	4.86
3. I learned:							
Very much	33/79%	9/21%				Very little	4.79
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	37/84%	6/14%	1/2%			Very little	4.82

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.79

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

43/100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 37/100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 36/97% No 1/3% _____

Date: January 21, 1981 Site: TMC - Wintergarten

Trainer: Donna Bricker Session: Language, Development Through Storytelling

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 17. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	85%	7.5%	7.5%			Boring	4.8
Well Organized	83%	17%				Confusing	4.8
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	88%	6%	6%			Not practical	4.4
3. I learned:							
Very much	88%	12%				Very little	4.5
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	88%	12%	12%			Very little	4.5
5. Overall this session was:						Average	4.6
Understandable		Too Complex				Too Simple	
100%							

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

Date: January 21, 1981 Site: TMC - Wintergarten

Trainer: Donna Bricker Session: Language Development Trhough Storytelling

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 21. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	94%	6%				Boring	4.1
Well Organized	100%					Confusing	5
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	100%					Not practical	5
3. I learned:							
Very much	100%					Very little	5
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	100%					Very little	5

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.82

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

Date: March 16, 1981 Site: TMC - Wintergarten

Trainer: Mary Grace Session: Teaching Team: Organizing

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 48. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	42/88%	3/6%	3/6%			Boring	4.81
Well Organized	38/84%	3/7%	3/7%		1/2%	Confusing	4.71
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	32/74%	7/17%	2/5%	1/2%	1/2%	Not practical	4.58
3. I learned:							
Very much	35/73%	8/17%	3/6%	1/2%	1/2%	Very little	4.56
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	30/68%	4/9%	2/5%	1/2%	7/16%	Very little	4.11
5. Overall this session was:						Average	4.55
Understandable 42/100%			Too Complex			Too Simple	

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 41/100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 39/95% No 2/5% _____

Date: March 16, 1981 Site: Wintergarten

Trainer: Donna Bricker Session: Child Development

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 43. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	80%	13%	7%			Boring	4.7
Well Organized	86%	5.5%	8.5%			Confusing	4.8
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	77%	18%	5%			Not practical	4.7
3. I learned:							
Very much	70%	21%	7%		2%	Very little	4.5
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	61%	24%	15%			Very little	4.4

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.62

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 94% No 6%

Date: March 17, 1981 Site: Wintergarten/Eagle Pass

Trainer: Donna Bricker/Mary Grace Session: Dase Study

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 19. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	76%	18%	6%			Boring	4.7
Well Organized	73%	20%	7%			Confusing	4.7
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	56%	33%	11%			Not practical	4.4
3. I learned:							
Very much	50%	28%	17%	5%		Very little	4.2
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	50%	28%	17%	5%		Very little	4.2

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.44

Understandable	Too Complex	Too Simple
94%		6%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 100% No _____ _____

Date: March 17, 1981 Site: Wintergarten

Trainer: Donna Bricker/Mary Grace Session: Composite Evaluation of Naptime and Case Study

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 22. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	91%	9%				Boring	4.9
Well Organized	95%	5%				Confusing	4.95
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	95%	5%				Not practical	4.95
3. I learned:							
Very much	95%	5%				Very little	4.95
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	81%	4.5%	10%	4.5		Very little	4.6

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.87

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 92% No 8%

Date: March 17, 1981 Site: Wintergarten

Trainer: Donna Bricker/Mary Grace Session: Naptime Procedures - Conducted by Head Teacher
Mary Grace/Donna Bricker coordinating

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was 20. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting	83%	11%	6%			Boring	4.8
Well Organized	81%	13%	6%			Confusing	4.8
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful	80%	10%	10%			Not practical	4.7
3. I learned:							
Very much	75%	15%	10%			Very little	4.7
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much	75%	10%	10%	5%		Very little	4.6

5. Overall this session was: Average 4.72

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

100%

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes 100% No _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes 95% No 5%

APPENDIX E

EXAMPLES OF EVALUATION FORMS

S.E.D.L. - Special Projects
1-80

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Date:_____ Session Title:_____

Please evaluate this workshop by circling the appropriate number on each scale. Thank you.

The presentation was: interesting 5 4 3 2 1 boring

well organized 5 4 3 2 1 confusing

The information presented was:

practical, useful 5 4 3 2 1 not practical, or applicable to my situation

Overall I learned: very much 5 4 3 2 1 very little

Overall I learned more about working with handicapped children.

very much 5 4 3 2 1 very little

Overall this session information was (circle one):

understandable too complex too little

I will use some of the ideas/activities in my classroom. Yes_____ No_____

If yes, which one(s):

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

What part(s) of the workshop did you find most helpful?

_____

_____

_____

_____

I would attend another training workshop like this one. Yes_____ No_____

If yes, what topic(s) would be of interest to you?

_____

_____

EVALUATION

What is your position (teacher, assistant teacher, etc.)?

_____

What other type(s) of training have you received related to working with young children? (list or describe)

_____

Session 1 Title:_____

1. Which activity or part of the session was most informative?

   _____

   Why?_____

2. What changes would you make?_____

3. What could we include to make this session better?

   _____

4. What could we leave out to make this session better?

   _____

Session 2 Title:_____

1. Which activity or part of the session was most informative?

   _____

   Why?_____

2. What changes would you make?_____

3. What could we include to make this session better?

   _____

4. What could we leave out to make this session better?

   _____

Are you interested in attending future workshops related to working with young children?

(Circle one) Yes No

List topics in which you are most interested for future workshops.

_____

_____

For future workshops, which would be the most convenient:

Weekday Weekday Evening (after 5:00) Saturday

Session _____

EVALUATION Title _____

1. Did you learn anything?

   Yes No

   Comments _____

2. Was the information presented useful? (Will it help you in working in the classroom?)

   Yes No

3. Which activity or part of the session was most informative?

   _____

   Why? _____

4. What else could we include to make this session better?

   _____

   _____

5. What could we leave out, if anything?

   _____

6. Would you make any other changes?

   Explain _____

   _____

7. What is you position (teacher, assistant teacher, etc.)?

   _____

8. What other type(s) of training have you received related to handicapped children? (List or describe)

   _____

   _____

9. What type of training would you like to have related to handicapped children?

   _____

   _____

Date: _____ Site: _____

Trainer: _____ Session: _____

EVALUATION SUMMARY

The total number of participants was _____. Some participants did not complete the evaluation form. Therefore, responses to questions have been converted to percentages. The mean rating and percentage of responses are shown for each of the evaluation questions.

Question	Rating 5	4	3	2	1		Mean Rating
1. Presentation was:							
Interesting						Boring	
Well Organized						Confusing	
2. Information was:							
Practical, useful						Not practical	
3. I learned:							
Very much						Very little	
4. I learned...working with handicapped child.							
Very much						Very little	

5. Overall this session was:

Understandable Too Complex Too Simple

6. I will use some of the ideas/activities: Yes_____ No_____ _____

7. Would attend another workshop? Yes_____ No_____ _____

PERSONAL DATA

NAME _____ DATE _____

Facility Name and City: _____

Type of Facility: ____Head Start
____Private Day Care
____Public Day Care
____Public School
____Private School

Position: ____Teacher
____Aide
____Center Director
____Lead Teacher
____Other: _____

Sessions Attended: _____

_____

_____

_____

Number of children in your classroom: _____

Number of handicapped children in your classroom: _____

Number of children with problems: _____

Briefly describe: _____

_____

Educational Background:
(check last grade completed)

____1 - 8 grade
____8 - 12 grade
____Some college
____B.A. degree
____Masters degree

Experience Background:
(check number of years of teaching experience)

____0 - 1 year experience
____1 - 3 years experience
____3 - 5 years experience
____5 - 10 years experience
____10+ years experience

Have you attended previous SEDL workshops? ____yes ____no

Approximate number: ____1 - 5 workshops ____5 - 10 workshops ____more than 10 workshops

Briefly describe activities or ideas from the workshops that you have used in your classroom:

_____

SITE REPORT SUMMARY

SITE: _____ KEY: # of C - Number of children in referral
# of HC - Number of handicapped served
* Other - Center Director

EDL STAFF: _____

SITE DESCRIPTION:

Training Sessions	Date	Type of Facility	Number of Participants			Number of Children		Session Effectiveness (Average)
			Teacher	Aide	*Other	# of C in Ref.	# of HC Served	

Participant Comments:

Trainer Comments: